| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| | | 1 | |
| 1 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS | | |
| 2 | TYLER TEXAS | | |
| 3 | STRAGENT, LLC, ET AL | DOCKET 6:11CV421 | |
| 4 | VS. | MARCH 10, 2014 | |
| 5 | 70. | 8:52 A.M. | |
| 6 | INTEL CORPORATION | TYLER, TEXAS | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | VOLUME 1 OF, PAGES 1 THROUGH 366 | | |
| 9 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | UNITED STATES FEDERAL CIRCUIT JUDGE | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | ALBRI | EL A. BENEFIELD TTON LAW FIRM | |
| 15 | | EST TYLER STREET OFFICE BOX 2649 | |
| 16 | LONGV | IEW, TEXAS 75606 | |
| 17 | | BUMGARDNER K. OLIN | |
| 18 | | SEY O'NEILL N BUMGARDNER CASTO, PC | |
| 19 | 313 W | EST 7TH STREET, SUITE 300 WORTH, TEXAS 76107 | |
| 20 | | COLEMAN | |
| | COLEM | AN & COLEMAN, PC | |
| 21 | AUSTI | OFFICE BOX 161957 N, TEXAS 78716 | |
| 22 | MICHA | EL E. JOFFRE | |
| 23 | KELLO | IE L. BOSTWICK GG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, | |
| 24 | | & FIGEL M STREET NW, SUITE 400 | |
| 25 | WASHI | NGTON, DC 20036 | |
| | | | |

| | | | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1 | | CHAD S. CAMPBELL TYLER R. BOWEN PERKINS COIE, LLP - PHOENIX | |
| 3 | | 2901 N. CENTRAL AVENUE SUITE 2000 | |
| 4 | | PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85012 | |
| 5 | | DAVID J. BURMAN PERKINS COIE, LLP - SEATTLE 1201 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 4900 | |
| 6 | | SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101 | |
| 7 | | MICHAEL E. JONES JOHN FREDERICK BUFE | |
| 8 | | POTTER MINTON, PC 110 NORTH COLLEGE, SUITE 500 | |
| 9 | | TYLER, TX 75710 | |
| 10 | | ROBERT CHRISTOPHER BUNT PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH | |
| 11 | | 100 EAST FERGUSON, SUITE 1114 TYLER, TEXAS 75702 | |
| 12 | | TILLIN, TEAMS TOTOL | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | COURT REPORTERS: | CHRISTINA L. BICKHAM, CRR-RMR TONYA B. JACKSON, RPR-CRR | |
| 15 | | FEDERAL OFFICIAL REPORTER 300 WILLOW, SUITE 239 | |
| 16 | | BEAUMONT, TEXAS 77701 | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | PROCEEDINGS REPORTED USING COMPUTERIZED STENOTYPE; TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED VIA COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION | | |
| 20 | TRANSCRITT TRODUCED V | TA COM CIER AIDED TRANSCRIPTION. | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | | | |

INDEX PAGE VOIR DIRE BY MR. ALBRITTON VOIR DIRE BY MR. JONES JURY SEATED COURT'S PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ALBRITTON OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. CAMPBELL DIRECT EXAMINATION OF STEPHEN MILLIGAN CROSS-EXAMINATION OF STEPHEN MILLIKEN REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF STEPHEN MILLIGAN DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF WALTER MILLIKEN DIRECT EXAMINATION OF HENRY HOUH CROSS-EXAMINATION OF HENRY HOUH REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF HENRY HOUH DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF DANA HAYTER DIRECT EXAMINATION OF KEVIN ZILKA COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

| 1 | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|-------------|---|
| 1 | INDEX OF EXHIBITS | | 4 |
| 2 | | <u>PAGE</u> | |
| 3 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 171 | 148 | |
| 4 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 172 | 148 | |
| 5 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 | 149 | |
| 6 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 | 150 | |
| 7 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 | 150 | |
| 8 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 | 152 | |
| 9 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 | 152 | |
| 10 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, 2, and 3 | 153 | |
| 11 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 | 230 | |
| 12 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 | 230 | |
| 13 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 | 230 | |
| 14 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 | 230 | |
| 15 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 | 230 | |
| 16 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 48 | 231 | |
| 17 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 39 | 234 | |
| 18 | Number 39 | 235 | |
| 19 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 149 | 235 | |
| 20 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 149 | 239 | |
| 21 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 48 | 254 | |
| 22 | Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 | 263 | |
| 23 | PTX 1, 2, and 3 | 287 | |
| 24 | PTX 1 | 287 | |
| 25 | PTX 2 | 287 | |
| | | | |

| _ | cary march to all march to, but | | |
|----|---------------------------------|-----|---|
| | | | 5 |
| 1 | PTX 3 | 287 | |
| 2 | PTX 1 | 288 | |
| 3 | PTX 2 | 288 | |
| 4 | PTX 149 | 288 | |
| 5 | PTX 149 | 288 | |
| 6 | PTX 50 and 51 | 292 | |
| 7 | PTX 50 | 292 | |
| 8 | PTX 51 | 293 | |
| 9 | PTX 50 | 296 | |
| 10 | PTX 105, PTX 106 and PTX 107 | 300 | |
| 11 | PTX 106 and PTX 107 | 300 | |
| 12 | PTX 107 | 300 | |
| 13 | PTX 105 through 107 | 300 | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | Defendant's Exhibit 150 | 162 | |
| 17 | Defendant's Exhibit 150 | 258 | |
| 18 | DTX 130 | 300 | |
| 19 | DTX 130 | 300 | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | | | |

```
(REPORTER'S NOTES VOLUME 1, 8:52 A.M., MONDAY,
1
2
   MARCH 10, 2014, TYLER, TEXAS, HON. TIMOTHY B. DYK
3
   PRESIDING.)
4
              (Open court, all parties present, prospective
5
   jurors not present.)
6
                          We have a few matters I'd like to
              THE COURT:
   take care of before we bring in the jury panel. First of
   all, I notice there was an in limine motion filed last
   night, yesterday, with respect to the invalidity
10
   contentions.
                 Is that something that can wait to be
   resolved until we conclude court today?
11
12
              MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, Eric Albritton on
13
   behalf of the plaintiff.
              Generally that is fine, yes, your Honor.
14
                                                         The
15
   only issue is it relates to the instructions that I
16
   believe the jury is going to give the court this morning,
17
   the preliminary instructions. So, the court might want
   to resolve it before that because there is a direct
18
19
   relationship.
20
              THE COURT: How does it affect the preliminary
21
   instructions? I'm generally familiar with what the
22
   motion is though I haven't read it yet.
              MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir. The preliminary
23
   instructions lay out in detail the art that Intel
24
   contends renders the patents -- or the patent claims
25
```

```
obvious --
2
              THE COURT:
                          No.
                               No.
                                    The final instructions
3
   do that, but the preliminary instructions don't.
4
              MR. ALBRITTON: I apologize, your Honor. I've
   got the two confused. Then no, we don't need to resolve
6
   it this morning.
7
                          Okay.
              THE COURT:
8
              MR. CAMPBELL: No disagreement here, your
9
   Honor.
              THE COURT:
10
                          Okay.
                                 Now, there's also the
   motion for clarification. Is that something that can
11
   wait until the end of the day as well?
12
13
              MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir.
14
              MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. And who is going to be
   doing the jury selection? Mr. Albritton and
16
   Mr. Campbell?
17
              MR. JONES: Mr. Jones, Mike Jones, your Honor,
18
19
   for Intel.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. And who is going to be
   doing the opening statements?
21
22
              MR. ALBRITTON: I will, your Honor, on behalf
23
   of the plaintiffs.
              MR. CAMPBELL: I'll be doing the opening for
24
25
   Intel.
```

THE COURT: And Mr. Campbell. Okay.

Now, I've been working on the final jury instructions; and I'm hoping to have a preliminary draft of that available for you by the end of the day today. And what I'd like to do is to have an informal conference about the final jury instructions at the conclusion of court on Tuesday in which we'll try to resolve as many issues as possible. That won't be the time for making the formal objections. That will be at the charge conference. But it would be helpful to me if you could take the draft final instructions and do what you did with the preliminary instructions so that I can see what the areas of disagreement are and what suggestions you have so that when we get together on Tuesday after court, we can go through that. Any questions about that?

MR. ALBRITTON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, there is one issue that came up in looking at your proposed final jury instructions and the preliminary instructions; and that is, in the preliminary instructions there is a statement that Stragent is not seeking damages for claim 1 of the '244 patent. And I noticed in the final jury instructions you seem to disagree about that. There was no objection to that sentence in the preliminary instructions. Where do we stand on that?

MR. ALBRITTON: Where we stand on that, your Honor, Dr. Vellturo is not going to opine specifically about damages related solely to the claim 1 of the '244 patent. However, as the trial develops, there may be some testimony that comes in, for instance, on cross-examination of Ms. Woodford that would form a basis for a damage claim with respect to the '244. So, I think we -- if it pleases the court, we could defer that issue until the evidence comes in because I think that will resolve it one way or the other.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mr. Campbell, is that --

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, there is a motion in limine on this issue; and we don't have an objection to the preliminary instruction as it is framed. If Mr. Albritton plans to elicit testimony about this topic, I believe it would require approaching the court first to resolve it.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that; and I assume that's what he proposes to do. But for the moment I have to give the preliminary instructions right now. There is a sentence in there that says that they are not seeking damages for claim 1, and I think the suggestion is to delete that sentence from the preliminary instructions and simply continue to mention that they are

```
seeking damages for the other two claims but don't say that they are not seeking damages for claim 1.
```

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that acceptable?

MR. CAMPBELL: It is acceptable.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else that either of you has that we ought to discuss before we bring the jury panel in?

MR. ALBRITTON: No, sir, your Honor.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, just one caution. In doing the jury questioning for your 20 minutes each, I do want you to be careful not to argue the case through the questions that you ask to the jury panel. I feel strongly about that so -- I don't want to have to stop you from questioning, but just be careful not to use that as the opportunity for arguing your case.

For example, I'd prefer you not ask has anybody ever stolen anything from you and how would you feel if something had been stolen from you. That sort of thing, seems to me, tends to go over the line in terms of arguing the case as opposed to selecting the jury. Any

```
11
1
   questions about that?
2
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Not on behalf of the
3
   plaintiff, your Honor.
4
              MR. JONES:
                          No, your Honor.
5
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. All right.
                                            Then we'll
6
   recess for a moment and we'll bring the jury panel in and
   then we'll begin. Okay?
8
              (Recess, 8:59 a.m. to 9:16 a.m.)
9
              (Prospective Jurors present.)
10
              THE COURT:
                          Good morning.
                                        Ladies and
11
   gentlemen of the jury panel, you've already been welcomed
   to the United States District Court for the Eastern
12
13
   District of Texas; but let me extend a warm welcome on
14
   behalf of myself. My name is Timothy Dyk.
                                                I'll be the
15
   judge in this case. I don't normally hear cases in
16
   Texas. I sit in a Court of Appeals in Washington but
17
   Chief Judge Davis asked me to come here and help out and
   I was happy to do so and I look forward to our time
18
19
   together.
20
              Now, let me just introduce some people in the
               My law clerk Sanjeev Laud is sitting there to
21
   courtroom.
22
   my left. He'll be assisting me, as well as the court
23
   staff. And we have here Rosa Ferguson who is the
24
   courtroom deputy. The court reporters are Tonya Jackson
25
   and Chris Bickham. And our court security officer is Tom
```

Blanton.

Before we start, I want to emphasize how much we appreciate your jury service and how important jury service is. Service on an American jury is really one of the highest privileges and responsibilities in our democracy; and it's so important that while federal judges such as myself are excused from jury service in our own court, we're often called to jury service ourselves in state court. I'm called every two years, and I sit where you are sitting.

And your role is not only important, it's central and critical to the importance of the justice system and I thank you for being here and for your service and look forward to your participation.

Now, our first order of business today will be to select a panel of jurors for this case; and ultimately there will be eight jurors selected. And, of course, there are many more of you here than the eight who will be finally selected. That happens in every case. The process for selection of the final jury involves my asking you questions. Then I'll give the lawyers an opportunity to ask questions. And once the eight jurors have been selected, those of you who are not selected, with our thanks, may leave.

The process after the jury is selected is as

follows: The party who brought this case, the plaintiff, which is Stragent, LLC, will present opening statement; then the defendant, which is Intel Corporation, will present an opening statement. Both sides will present witnesses. After the witnesses have been presented, I will give final instructions to the jury; and then the jury who is selected will deliberate.

The trial will be approximately 9:00 in the morning until 5:30 each day, though there may be some days that I will ask you to start earlier or to go a bit later to keep up. We are planning to finish this week, but it is possible that we would go over until Saturday morning or even into next week.

Now, I'm going to ask you a few questions; and as I mentioned, the lawyers will ask you questions for a while. The lawyers, in asking the jurors questions, may ask general questions; or there may be a specific question directed to an individual juror. And that's all part of the process that the lawyers are allowed to play in selecting a jury. The purpose of all of this is to select what the lawyers think is a fair and impartial jury.

Now, let me add one other point; and that is it's not my purpose in questioning you or the lawyers' purpose in questioning you to pry into your personal

affairs. It doesn't happen often but if a question comes up that you don't want to respond to in public, all you have to do is say, "I'd like to talk to you in private, Judge Dyk" and you can come up to the bench and we can have a private discussion about anything that bothers you. And this is not a process that is intended in any way to invade your privacy, but there are questions that need to be asked to secure a jury.

Now let me add one final point. And that is whether you're selected or not, it doesn't in any way reflect on you if you are not selected. It's just part of the process. It doesn't mean that anybody thinks you can't be fair. It doesn't mean that someone doesn't like you. It's just part of the process in which jurors are selected every day in courtrooms around the country.

Now, we're going to begin with a list of questions which will appear on your screens; and my law clerk will put them up there.

All right. So, I'm going to ask you to go by your juror number and to answer the questions. I'm not sure how we're going to deal with the jurors who are sitting in the audience. We'll have to find some way for you -- I guess there is a screen over to your left that you can look at when you're responding to the questions.

So, why don't we begin with Juror Number 1.

If you would just respond to each of these questions, that would be helpful; and then we'll go on to Juror Number 2. And there is a microphone for you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi. My name is Andrea

Jones, and I'm Juror Number 1. My spouse's name is

Zachary Jones. And I am a teacher at a day care. I

have -- my spouse is a salary manager at Walmart. And I

have two children. In my free time I like to just be
outdoors with my family.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Juror Number 2. My name is Joe Leach. My spouse's name is Mona Leach. I am a salary manager with the Home Depot. My wife is also a -- works for Home Depot. We have five children. Two of them are adults, and one of them is -- his occupation is college, and the other one is a mother. And my spare time -- with five kids, that's my spare time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. Bryan
Branch, Juror Number 3. My wife's name is Ladonna
Branch, and I am a self-employed land developer. My wife
is a hairstylist. I have two children, 6 and 4; and in
my spare time I like to take them to their favorite park
and climb any hill or mountain I can find and do anything
outdoors.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Richard McDaniel. I'm Juror Number 4. My occupation is self-employed parking lot striping. My spouse is a teacher. I have one child, and we like to spend time with our child and travel in our free time.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Annie Spencer.

I'm a divorcee. I retired from Carrier's

air-conditioning. I have two children. They're both

adults. And I like to fish.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. Matthew Leach. I'm a hydraulic mechanic. My spouse's name is Allison Leach. She's an insurance agent. We have one child who is 5. And in our spare time I play softball, and I teach my son T-ball.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Vesta Talbert. I'm Juror Number 7. My spouse's name is Travis Talbert. I am an ophthalmic technician for an eye doctor. My husband is a water well service supervisor. I have three children. The oldest one works at Walmart distribution, the middle one works with my husband, and the youngest one works at Walmart. And in our spare time we like to have cookouts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Bill Priddy, Juror

Number 8. My wife's name is Theresa. We have two adult children. One is a homemaker, and the other is a schoolteacher. And in my spare time I like to spend time outdoors.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Michael Roark.

I'm Juror Number 9. I'm not married. I've worked for

Smith County as an assistant veteran service officer.

And my spare time I spend mostly outdoors.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Steven Gibbs, Number 10.

Regina Gibbs. I'm an oil field truck driver. She is a veterinary practice manager. We have two children, a boy and a girl. I have a stepdaughter who is 19, works at Burger King. And free time, I like to spend with family and sleep.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Marilyn Johnston,

Juror Number 11; and my spouse's name is Joe Ed Johnston.

I'm semi-retired, interior designer; and my husband's

occupation is a Northwestern Mutual financial planner. I

have two children. One is a Northwestern Mutual planner

in Houston, Texas. The other one is in the ministry at

College Station, Texas, and is a fellowship athletics director and -- Christian director. And my free time, I have five wonderful grandchildren; and I love baby-sitting.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Charles Leffall. I'm Juror Number 12. My wife's name is Gloria Leffall. I'm kind of up here. I can't --sometimes it's good to be tall, and sometimes it's not. My wife is a salaried supervisor with Neiman Marcus. I do have -- well, I'm actually retired, a retired educator; and I do have two adult children. One is an attorney in Bryan/College Station. The other one is a registered nurse in Houston. And I love messing with the cows on my farm.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Jerry Rogers. My wife he is Hollie Rogers. She is a teacher at a day care. I have two children. One is 6 and one is 11 and they're both in school. And my free time I just spend out in the farm playing around, like he said, with the animals.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Carolyn Morris. My husband's name is James Morris. I'm

a retired licensed vocational nurse. My husband is retired from Terry County Sheriff's Department as the deputy sheriff and a private investigator. I have three grown children. My daughter is an LVN, and both of my sons are in construction. And free time, I like to do needlework.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Randee

Cheatham, Juror Number 15. My husband's name is also

Randy Cheatham. I'm a part-time admin assistant for

Green Acres Baptist Church. My husband is a store

director for Super 1. We have three kids. They're all

in school. And I spend time with my family.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hello. My name is Kevin Kimbrell, Juror Number 16. My wife's name is Amy Kimbrell. I'm a computer technician for a inspection company at the local refinery. My wife is a registered nurse. I have two children, 4 and 1. And with what little spare time I have, I like to study biblical and other religious teachings and then also martial arts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi. My name is Megan

Morgan. I'm Juror Number 17. My husband's name is Ryan

Morgan. I work with Daymon Worldwide doing private brand

development. My husband is a petroleum landman. We have one daughter who is not an adult yet. And in my spare time, I just like to spend it with her and my husband.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Arthur

McKenzie. I'm Juror Number 18. My spouse's name is Rita

McKenzie. I'm a police officer for Chandler, Texas, here
in Chandler. My wife retired from the DPS office. I

have two children now. My daughter does psychology down
in Austin; and my son, he's a factory worker up in

Denning. And I like to fish on my time off.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Gloria Robinson. My spouse's name is Larry. I'm a retired program manager for Health and Human Services, and I currently went to work part-time for H&R Block. My spouse is a supervisor with the Palestine Regional Hospital. I have two adult children. My daughter is a psychologist with Texas Youth Commission, and my son is a manager at Kentucky Fried Chicken. In my free time I like to take pictures and scrapbook.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Jeff Hurley. My wife's name is Mary. I am an area general manager for the East Texas region of my credit

union. My wife is head librarian in Mineola, Texas. I have four children, two adults, one at SMU, one former Army after eight years. And in my spare time, I'm an actor/director/producer of theatre film and television ads.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Roy Cox. My wife's name is Joanne, 14 years. I'm a retired truck driver. I did that for 20 years. Her occupation is she works as a office manager or transportation manager for a company she's been with for 20 years. I have six children, three boys and three girls. Two of the girls are housewives. One of the girls is retired military, a schoolteacher. Two of the boys are in construction, and one of the boys is a manager at Walmart. And I'm an elder in my church, and that pretty much takes up all of my spare time.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Cynthia Duncan. My husband's name -- oh. I'm Juror 22. My husband's name is Bill Duncan. I am an elementary schoolteacher. My husband is a surveying engineer for a coal company. I have two grown children, one who will begin medical school in this summer and the other one who works in the music instrument business. In my spare time I watch TV

and read.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Lynda David. I'm

Juror Number 23. I am the assistant vice-president and

marketing director for a local bank. My husband is Jerry

David, and he is a machinist. We have two children. One

is at Texas A&M, a political science major; and our

youngest is a public relations major at Stephen F.

Austin. And in my spare time I have a very expensive

hobby of owning a ladies boutique also. So, that's my

hobby.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. My name is Vicki Walter. My husband is Scott. I work as a physical therapist assistant at ETMC outpatient rehab system. My husband is manager for Perma Green Lawn. And I have two young adult children. One is an employee at LensCrafters, and the other one is a graphic designer. And I spend as much time with them as I can as I'm ready to have an empty nest.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. I'm Barbara Sharp. My husband's name is Don Sharp. I work for Trinity Valley Community College as a correctional education clerk. My husband is a teacher for Aldine ISD.

We have three adult children. Our oldest is a teacher in Pasadena ISD. Our middle child is a Super Senior at SFA. And our youngest child is traveling abroad in Australia for approximately a year. And in my spare time it's just busy with all of them.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Carl Hoffman.

I'm Juror 26. My wife's name is Barbara. I retired from Verizon Communications but presently working part-time with inline traffic control out of Bryan, Texas. My wife is a legal secretary for a law firm in Henderson. I have one adult child. She's an EMT. And in my spare time I just like to mess around on the 14 acres I have.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

All right. Thank you very much for your responses. Before I turn this over to the lawyers, I have a few additional questions for the jury panel. First, I'd like to ask whether anyone here has a hardship that would make it difficult for him or her to serve on the jury. As I mentioned, this case will probably go through Friday and potentially even to next week and concluding Saturday morning. And if anyone has a hardship, you should stand up and let me know. And I don't mean a hardship is having to wake up early and get here to court. I mean having surgery or some other

```
2.4
   important appointment that would prevent you from being
2
   here.
3
              Is there anyone on the jury panel who would
   have a hardship?
4
5
              Yes?
6
              Could you give us your juror number, please?
7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Number 11, Marilyn
              My husband has kidney stones, and he may have
8
   Johnston.
   to go into the hospital for them to remove them this week
10
          I don't know if that's considered, but I would
11
   have to take him.
12
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Thank you.
13
              Is there anyone --
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   My name is Annie Spencer.
15
   I'm Juror Number 5. I help take care of my mom. She's
16
   91, and she can't stay by herself.
17
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                  Thank you.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Matt Leach, Juror
18
19
   Number 6.
              It would create a substantial financial burden
   on me and my family, and that would cause a lot of
20
21
   problems so...
22
              THE COURT:
                          Because you wouldn't be able to go
23
   to work, you mean?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes, sir.
25
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                  Anyone else?
```

All right. Unless there are objections from either the plaintiff or defendant, I'm inclined to excuse each of these three jurors on hardship grounds.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ ALBRITTON: We have no objection, your Honor.

MR. JONES: We agree, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to excuse the three of you, and you can leave now. We thank you for coming here today, and we will continue with the rest of the panel.

(Prospective Jurors 5, 6, and 11 exit the courtroom, 9:39 a.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. Now let me describe to you briefly the nature of this case. This is what's called a "patent infringement suit." The plaintiff, as I mentioned, is Stragent, LLC, and they own a patent and they are the plaintiff. They brought this suit. And as I also mentioned, the defendant is Intel Corporation; and Stragent accuses Intel of infringing two of its patents related to computer network processors that have specialized hardware to perform something called a "CRC operation." It's a kind of error check. And Intel is accused of violating these patents by making or using the patented invention.

Now, given that brief description, has anyone

heard anything about this specific case or has anybody worked for either of these companies or had a relative who has worked for either of these companies?

Yes. Could you stand and identify yourself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Juror Number 25, and
my brother works for Intel Corporation in Oregon.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Anyone else?

All right. Thank you.

Now I'm going to ask the lawyers who will be involved in this case to stand and introduce themselves and their colleagues and any corporate representatives who are with them, and then I'm going to ask the jurors if any of them -- any of you know any of these lawyers or has had any relationship with them. It's unlikely, but we have to go through this process.

Mr. Albritton, do you want to start?

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor.

Good morning. I'm Eric Albritton. I'm a lawyer over in Longview. My office is in downtown on Tyler Street. With me is Barry Bumgardner. He's a lawyer from Fort Worth. And his partner Jaime Olin, who is also a lawyer in Fort Worth, the three of us will be involved in the trial of the case.

Seated here at the table with us is Kevin

Zilka. He's one of the owners of Stragent, and he'll be at the trial with us throughout.

Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Campbell -- or

Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Thank you, your Honor. My name is Mike Jones. I'm a lawyer here in Tyler, Texas. I represent Intel Corporation in this case. Trying this case with me will be Mr. Chad Campbell, seated right here to my right. Seated right here to my left will also be Mr. David Burman. And here on behalf of Intel Corporation. Their representative is Mr. Robert Maddox, seated right there. And I apologize to everybody for having my back turned to you.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, does anyone on the jury panel know any of these lawyers or corporate representatives or have any relationship with any of them?

No? Okay. Good.

Next I'm going to ask Mr. Albritton and Mr. Jones to read the list of witnesses that each side plans to call; and I'm going to ask you the same question with respect to the witnesses, that is whether you know them or have any relationship with them.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your

Honor.

We're going to be calling Kevin Zilka. We're going to be calling a gentleman by videotaped deposition named Walter Milliken. We're going to be calling a gentleman named Steve Milligan -- Milliken and Milligan. We're going to be calling a gentleman by the name of Harold Stone, a gentleman by the name of Chris Vellturo, and a gentleman by the name of him Henry Houh.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: Yes. We will be calling a Mr. Gavin Stark. We will be calling a Mr. Robert Maddox. We will be calling a Ms. Mary Woodford. We will be calling Mr. Dana Hayter. We will be calling -- I may let Mr. Campbell take over at this point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. We'll be calling a gentleman by the name of Debendra das Sharma, a gentleman by the name of Matt Adiletta, Brad Burres, and Dr. Harry Bims.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone on the juror panel know any of these witnesses or have any relationship with them?

I don't see any hands. Okay. Thank you.

All right. Now, there's just one more general question and this is really the most important question I'm going to ask you and that is if you're selected to

sit on this case, will you be able to render a verdict solely on the evidence presented at the trial and based on the law that I give you at the end of the trial and my instructions to you? And if the answer is no or you have any reservations on this, please let me know.

Okay. I don't see any hands. Thank you.

Now I'm going to turn the questioning over to the lawyers. They'll have about 20 minutes a side to ask you questions, and then we'll take a morning break.

So, Mr. Albritton.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your Honor.

This is not a timer. I'm not up here calling anybody, just in case you were wondering. Thank you very much.

May it please the court, Mr. Jones, Mr. Campbell.

Good morning. As I told you, I'm Eric

Albritton. I'm a lawyer over in Longview. You had to

tell us about yourself; so, I'll very quickly tell you

about me. I'm married. My wife is a LPC. She's a

counselor, although she stays at home and has for 16

years because we've got a 16-year-old daughter who is a

Viewette over at Longview High School. And we've got a

little boy named Luke who is in the seventh grade. What

I do in my spare time, I like to hunt and fish; but I do lots of kids' activities. My daughter is a horseback rider. I go to lots of horse shows, and I go to football games.

This is the most unusual part of the trial. This is really the only time that we're going to get to hear your voices. And, so, it's important that you take that opportunity and talk to us because we're not --nobody -- and his Honor alluded to this. I am quite certain that you are all fair people. Okay? There is no question about that. But we all have our own life experiences that make us the right kind of juror for some cases and the wrong kind of juror for other kinds of cases. So, let me give you an example.

As I said, I have two kiddos. Okay? I would be not the right kind of person to sit on a jury in a criminal case, for instance, where the person was accused of hurting a teenaged child. That would be very hard for me based on my own personal experiences and who I am and where I am in life.

And, so, that's the reason we're asking these questions, not to see if you're fair but to see if this is the right kind of case for you. So, I would ask you to please visit with me and also Mr. Jones and tell us what you think because, interestingly enough, the people

```
32
              Yes, ma'am.
                           That's Ms. David?
1
2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  What if you don't know?
3
              MR. ALBRITTON: You don't know?
4
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know I have mutual
5
   funds, but I don't -- and I know they are in some tech
6
   funds, but I don't know if it is in Intel.
7
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Okay. Thank you very much.
   That's Ms. David, Number 23.
8
9
              Anybody else?
10
              Yes, sir.
                         Mr. Kimbrell?
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I'm the same
12
   situation.
13
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Same situation. Thank you,
   Mr. Kimbrell, Number 16.
14
15
              All right.
                          Now let me ask you this:
   anybody ever gone out and bought a computer product
16
                                                           So,
17
   specifically because it included an Intel component?
   let me say it a different way. I see Ms. Sharp is
18
19
   shaking her head. Your brother, of course, works at
20
   Intel.
21
              Mr. Kimbrell raising your hand.
22
              So, let me ask it more broadly to make sure we
23
   catch everybody. Anybody ever go out and specifically
   buy some computer product because -- specifically because
24
25
   it had an Intel component in it?
```

```
Nobody other than Mr. Kimbrell and Ms. Duncan,
1
2
   22, you're raising your hand. Anybody else?
3
              THE COURT:
                          There are two on the left-hand
   side here.
4
5
              MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your
6
   Honor.
7
              That's Mr. Roark and Mr. --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
8
                                   Gibbs.
9
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Mr. Gibbs.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
10
                                   Yes.
11
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Okay. Thank you.
12
                           Ms. Robinson?
              Yes, ma'am.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We brought a computer that
14
   had an Intel processor.
15
              MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, ma'am. Did you buy it
   specifically because it had an Intel processor?
16
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Right.
              MR. ALBRITTON: Okay. Thank you,
18
19
   Ms. Robinson, Number 19.
20
              Has anybody ever gone out and purchased a chip
   itself, an Intel chip, not a computer system but an
21
22
   actual Intel processor? Anybody ever done that?
23
              Thank you.
              Mr. Jones introduced himself. And I wanted to
24
   ask a little bit of a broader question. I know, for
25
```

```
instance, Ms. Cheatham, you're involved with Green Acres
2
   Church; is that right?
3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
4
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Do you know Mr. Jones?
                                                       Does
5
   he look familiar to you?
6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
                                       I actually work out
   at the south campus, and that's where I attend church.
8
              MR. ALBRITTON: Okay, great. Thank you very
9
   much.
10
              Now, Mr. Jones is in a law firm -- a pretty
11
   large law firm here, and there is a gentleman named John
   Bufe.
12
13
              If you would, stand, John.
14
              John Bufe. And Allen Gardner is another
15
   lawyer that is at his law firm. Has anybody -- does
16
   anybody know Mike Jones or anybody else that works at the
   law firm called "Potter Minton"? Anybody know any
17
   lawyers or legal assistants? They are the ones who
18
19
   actually do all the hard work. Anybody know any legal
   assistants at the law firm of Potter Minton?
20
21
                          There is also another law firm
              All right.
   involved here called "Parker, Bunt & Ainsworth." Robert
22
23
   Parker, Chris Bunt, and Charlie Ainsworth are involved.
24
              Chris, if you would, stand up.
25
              Does anybody know Chris Bunt or Charlie
```

Ainsworth or Robert Parker?

Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

If you would, bring up the first slide,

please.

What I'm going to do, ladies and gentlemen, is we don't have a lot of time so I'm going to just show you a few slides and I'm going to ask you some questions and basically we'll just take a show of hands and get numbers and then it will make it go.

Now, I'm not talking specifically about this case. I'm not arguing the case in any way. I just want to ask you some general questions about how you feel about things. Okay?

One of the things his Honor is going to tell you in this case is that the plaintiff Stragent has to prove infringement by what's called a "preponderance of the evidence." Preponderance means all you've got to do -- in a football analogy -- is get slightly over midfield. And if we move the ball just past midfield, we've proven our case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Now, in this case Intel is saying that the patents are invalid. They're saying that the Patent Office should not have ever issued these patents in the first instance. That's got a different burden. It's called "clear and convincing evidence." And his Honor,

Judge Dyk, is going to give you specific instructions about what that means.

But back to my Cowboys analogy, that means you've got to push the ball substantially past midfield and down into the red zone. So, as you can tell, the plaintiff has got this lesser burden, preponderance of the evidence; and the defendants, to prove invalidity, have this much higher burden, clear and convincing evidence.

Raise your hand if you think that seems fundamentally unfair to you. Nobody? Okay.

What I want to visit with you about now is we know that there have been some folks -- there was a question on your questionnaire about if you had ever been a defendant in a lawsuit. Let me see a show of hands again, anybody that's ever been sued.

Now I want to broaden out the question. Have any of you ever had a family member or a close friend that was sued and it was a lawsuit that you knew about?

Mr. Roark?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. ALBRITTON: Okay. Anybody else?

Okay. There are folks who believe that lawsuits are a bad thing, and there are folks that -- let me put it simply. Some folks have very strong feelings

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
about lawsuits. Okay? And one of the beautiful things
about this country, of course, is that we are all allowed
to have our own opinions. So, what I'd like to do now is
ask you to raise your hand if you agree or strongly agree
with the following. And this is going to be the way I
ask a series of questions.
           "I have been negatively impacted by lawsuits."
Raise your hand if you feel like you strongly agree or
agree that you have been negatively impacted.
          Mr. Branch, Number 3; Mr. Roark, Number 9.
          Anybody else agree?
          Yes, sir. Mr. -- that's Mr. Hurley,
Number 21.
          Yes, sir. That's Mr. McKenzie, Number 18.
          Anybody else?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                              That was 20.
          MR. ALBRITTON:
                          20, I'm sorry. Mr. Hurley,
okay.
```

The next one is -- let me strike this. I'll try to get higher -- move on.

Let me ask you this. This case -- sometimes lawsuits are filed by people, and sometimes they are filed by companies. Okay? And in some situations the company that's filing the lawsuit bought the patent, bought the property from somebody else. What I want to

know is who agrees or strongly agrees with this statement. "I would award less money to a company that bought a patent than to a person that personally developed the invention."

Does anybody agree or strongly agree with that statement?

Nobody?

Also in a lawsuit you're going to hear, ladies and gentlemen, that -- sometimes witnesses are going to get right here on this very witness stand, and they're going to testify live. But sometimes witnesses can't come to trial, for a variety of reasons; and, so, what you will do is you will get to hear their deposition.

Okay? That means they won't be here in Tyler. You'll just get to watch their videotape of what they said before under oath.

What about this: Does anybody agree or strongly agree with the following statement? "I would need to hear from the person who came up with the invention in order to find for somebody in a lawsuit." Anybody strongly agree with that or agree with that?

Okay. So, the flip side is the truth, right? If you don't strongly agree with that, you can certainly consider finding for somebody even if they don't come here live. Everybody agree with that?

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Let me ask you this. Sometimes in
lawsuits companies just like this -- there are disputes
between parties.
                 Okay? It would be nice if everybody
was able to get along and reach agreements outside of
court but sometimes that doesn't happen and you have to
come to court and have a lawsuit. Some people just think
that's distasteful. Okay? And that's fine. As I said,
everybody is entitled to their own view of that.
           I want to ask you this:
                                  "If I were on a
jury" -- think about this yourself -- "I would be less
likely to find in favor of a company that had sued
another person before." Who strongly believes that or
agrees with that?
          What about you, Mr. Priddy? Do you agree or
strongly agree with that statement?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                              I agree.
          MR. ALBRITTON: You do agree with that
statement.
          Anybody else?
          What about you, Mr. Roark? Are you like
Mr. Priddy? Do you agree or strongly agree with that
statement?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not really.
          MR. ALBRITTON:
                          Not really. Okay.
          Anybody else agree with Mr. Priddy?
                                               That is,
```

```
40
   if you were on a jury, you would be less likely to find
   for a company that had sued before?
3
              Yes, ma'am.
                           That's Ms. --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   24.
4
5
              MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Walter,
6
   Number 24.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It would depend on how
7
   much suing they had been doing.
8
9
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Okay.
                                      Thank you. That's a
   very relevant question. I agree.
10
11
              Ms. Sharp, do you feel the same way?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
12
13
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                               Thank you.
14
              Anybody else?
15
              Ms. Sharp is Number 25.
16
              Yes, sir. Mr. Kimbrell, 16, do you agree or
17
   strongly agree with that also?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, with her stipulation
19
   of how much --
20
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                               Depends on how many times.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
22
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Thank you very much.
23
              Let me ask you this. Sometimes in situations
24
   one company should have to pay a certain amount of money
25
   than another company, based on the individual facts and
```

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
41
```

circumstances. What I want to know is this. Who agrees or strongly agrees with this statement, "No company should have to pay more for using a patent than another company using the same patent even if they make more money from using it"? Now, that's a lot of words; so, let me repeat it to you again. It's a little -- I wrote the question. It's not the best one in the whole world, I'll admit. "No company should have to pay more money for using a patent than another company had to pay for using the same patent even if that previous company had made a lot more money." Does anybody feel that way? Mr. Roark, you feel that way. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Mr. -- is that Mr. Hoffman? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. MR. ALBRITTON: 26. That's Ms. Walter, Number 24; Ms. David, Number 23; Ms. Robinson, Number 19; Mr. Kimbrell, Number 16; Ms. Sharp, Number 25. Then we've got Mr. Priddy, Number 8. We've got Mr. Branch, Number 3. We've got Ms. Jones, Number 1. Then we have Ms. Talbert, Number 7, and Ms. Morris, Number 14. Thank you very much.

Yes, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Can I ask a question?

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0kay?

MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So, basically you're saying after they purchase it they will make more money from it?

MR. ALBRITTON: No, ma'am. What I'm saying is this. If you've got a company that is using somebody's patent without permission -- okay -- and they then ultimately come in and do the right thing and pay money for the right to use it. And then there is another company that doesn't have permission and is using it but is making lots and lots and lots and lots more money.

company -- do you think that later company that's made way more money than that former company should only have

Do you think it's unfair that that later

15 to pay what the former company paid?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And no backpay?

MR. ALBRITTON: Right.

 $\label{eq:prospective_juron} \mbox{PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Then I agree with } \\ \mbox{that.}$

MR. ALBRITTON: Okay.

Let me ask you this. Sometimes in the -- I call them "tinkerers" -- yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. That question is very misleading to some, or at least to me. You said for them using a patent.

```
MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Now, you didn't say illegally using a patent. I thought it was you purchased the patent and a company B purchased, both should purchase at the same price and whether the companies make money or not is not the patent holder's business.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I agree.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I agree.

MR. ALBRITTON: Okay. It was a poorly phrased question.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But that would have been illegal infringement.

MR. ALBRITTON: All right. I apologize.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Or if they're guilty in this case, which they probably are.

MR. ALBRITTON: Okay. I apologize for the confusion. I'm very sorry. What I'm just asking --well, I've only got a few more minutes. I understand, and certainly there was no intention to be misleading you. It was just confusing. But I think I've got an understanding of where folks are.

Sometimes there are people that -- I call them "tinkerers," you know, folks that are always working on things, a house, or trying to fix things. I'm not one of those people. Okay? Because some people are more

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
44
comfortable with technology than other people are.
I've got this question for you. Who agrees or strongly
agrees with the following? "I am comfortable talking
about computers and would not hesitate to share my
opinions about computers with other people."
          Okay. So, raise your hand if you agree or
strongly agree that you are comfortable talking about
computers and would not hesitate to share your opinions
about computers with other people.
          Mr. Gibbs, Number 10. Thank you, Mr. Gibbs.
          Ms. David, Number 23; Mr. Kimbrell, Number 16.
          Yes, sir. Mr. Hoffman, Number 26.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                               I know nothing.
          MR. ALBRITTON: You know nothing. Okay.
Thank you very much, Mr. Hoffman.
          Now, ladies and gentlemen, there are some
organizations out there like -- it's called "East Texans
Against Lawsuit Abuse" or "Texans for Lawsuit Reform."
Is anybody a member of any organizations such as that?
          Anybody got a close family member or friend
that's a member of an organization like East Texans
Against Lawsuit Abuse?
          All right.
                      Nobody.
          Let me ask you the last question.
```

Sometimes -- I've done this a number of times here in

Tyler and elsewhere in Texas; and sometimes somebody goes, "You know what? Mr. Albritton, if you could just ask me one more question, if he had just asked me this, I would have told him something that's important." Is there something, ladies and gentlemen, that you're sitting there thinking, "Wow. If I were Eric Albritton, I would want to know about this. I should tell him this if he asks me"? Is there anything like that out there, any question, any information that you think is important that I haven't had a chance to specifically ask you about?

Nothing? All right. Great. Thank y'all very much.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Thank you, your Honor.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury panel, my name is Mike Jones. I'm a lawyer in Tyler, Texas. I've been doing this for, I think, 37 years. My wife and I have lived here for those 37 years and raised 2 children here, and we have 3 grandchildren.

Let me start out by doing one thing before I ask you a question; and that is on behalf of myself and particularly on behalf of my client Intel Corporation, I want to thank each and every one of you for your time and for your service as jurors. This is very a important

duty. Frankly, this is a very important case to Intel.

And in order to resolve the factual issues of this
dispute, we need your help and we thank you for being
here and we thank you for the time that you spend in this
endeavor.

The first question I want to ask you in this case -- and I'll pick on you, Mr. Hoffman, if you don't mind -- is this: Mr. Hoffman, you just said, in talking about a question that Mr. Albritton asked you, that you said, well, it depended upon whether they were guilty in this case which they probably are. Do you recall that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I do.

MR. JONES: Okay. You can understand why that might make me nervous because, you know, my client's position in this case is they are not guilty of infringement, that they don't infringe the patent at all. I assume you didn't mean that you had already formed any opinion. Is that fair?

 $\label{eq:probably lean more one} \mbox{ way than the other already}.$

MR. JONES: Okay. Sir, are you already, as we started this case, leaning against my client Intel? Is that fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just the fact that we're having to go through this, yes.

MR. JONES: Thank you very much. I appreciate your candor. Thank you for telling us that.

THE COURT: Could you identify the juror number for us?

MR. JONES: Yes, sir. And that is Juror Number 26, your Honor, Mr. Hoffman.

Thank you so much for your candor, sir. I really do appreciate that.

Which brings me to my question, my first question, which is probably the most important question I'm going to ask today, is who agrees with Mr. Hoffman? Who says, "Mr. Jones, we wouldn't be here today if Intel hadn't done something wrong?" Anybody else -- and I thank Mr. Hoffman for saying that. But does anybody else agree with that? You know, you sit there and go, "Yeah, if I'm really going to be honest with you, Mr. Jones, you're behind." Anybody else feel that way? Nothing wrong with feeling that way. If you do, just please raise your hand.

Another way to ask the question is does anybody think, you know, where there's smoke there's fire? You know, we wouldn't be in federal court, Judge Dyk wouldn't be here if there wasn't something to all of this? Anybody feel that way?

Thank you.

My next three questions are going to be about some legal principles, and they're going to be disputes in this case. We're not here to argue the disputes in this case; but there are going to be disputes in this case over, I think, three major areas. The first one is whether or not Intel products infringe.

Now, did y'all see the film about patent lawsuits? Y'all all saw the film. In the film it told us that in patents there are things called "claims" and those claims have elements and those elements describe the patented invention and describe the boundaries of what the people who own the patent, the boundaries of their rights. And I believe the film also said -- and you may be instructed on this at some point in this trial -- that in order for Intel products to infringe, they must meet or contain all of the elements of any claim that you find infringement of.

Now, does anybody disagree with that concept that all of the elements of a claim must be in a product for it to infringe? Anybody disagree with that concept?

Anybody think that's nitpicking, that 9 out of 10 ought to be good enough, 99 percent out of a hundred ought to be good enough, close ought to be good enough?

Anybody feel that way?

Thank you.

Another issue -- and again we're not here to argue it. Another issue in this case is going to be whether or not the patents are valid. And the film, I believe it said -- told you that a defendant has every right to come into court and to contend that a patent may be valid, that that's part of the patent system and Intel is doing that. Does anybody disagree with that concept? Does anybody think that if the Patent Office issued a patent, then Intel shouldn't be able to come to court and question its validity? Anybody feel like that?

I believe the film also told you a concept that you as jurors play a role in the patent system. It was your role, it was your function in the patent system to decide the factual issues concerning validity of these patents. Does anybody feel uncomfortable with that role? Does anybody say, "I just can't do that role even if that's the law"?

Anybody say, "If the patent examiner did it, I don't want to redo it"? Anybody feel like that?

Thank you so much.

The final issue that I would like to bring up that's going to be disputed in this case is the question of damages and how much is owed. And I want you to know that Intel expects to present evidence on each and every

25 issue in this case.

2

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, one time after I got through trying a case in front of a state jury, one of the jurors told me that the mere fact I presented evidence on damages, that they inferred from that that I was admitting that my client owed something. Now, does anybody feel that way? Do you feel merely because Intel will present evidence on every factual issue including damages, that by doing that somehow we admit that we owe something? Anybody feel like that? Thank you so much. Now, before today had anyone ever heard of the plaintiff corporation Stragent Corporation? Before today had you ever heard of the

corporations Aloft Media, Azure, or Oso Innovations? Ever heard of those companies?

Mr. Albritton mentioned that this patent had been purchased -- I think it was purchased from an entity known as "BBN." Have you ever heard of BBN Corporation?

How about its -- I believe it was a affiliate of Raytheon Corporation, the defense contractor. Any of you familiar with Raytheon Corporation?

Thank you.

And Juror Number 3 -- I believe that is Mr. Branch.

> PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

```
52
```

```
1
   for them for ten years.
2
              MR. JONES:
                          Thank you. And that would be
3
   Juror Number 16, Mr. Kimbrell, I believe.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
4
                                  Yes.
5
              MR. JONES: And then Juror Number 23,
6
   Ms. David?
7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
8
              MR. JONES:
                          And --
9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I used to be in economic
10
   development, and I just knew them through the economic
11
   development world.
12
                          Thank you. I appreciate it.
              MR. JONES:
13
              And Juror Number 9, I believe that's
   Mr. Roark, right, sir?
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  Yes.
16
              MR. JONES: And do you just know of them, or
17
   did you have some type of relationship?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was in the military. I
19
   tested their products.
20
              MR. JONES: You tested their products.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
21
                                  Yeah.
22
              MR. JONES: Thank you. Thank you, sir.
23
              Now, the inventor in this case, I think it
   would be unusual if any of you would know him; but I'll
24
   ask about that. The inventor of these patents is a
25
```

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Mr. Walter Milliken. Anybody know him, Walter Milliken?
           There are a number of attorneys in this case
that have appeared for Stragent. Not all of them have
been mentioned so far; but they include Ms. Debra
Coleman, Mr. Barry Bumgardner, Mr. Jaime Olin, Mr. Casey
O'Neill, Mr. Shawn Latchford, Mr. -- excuse me --
Ms. Andralee Lloyd, Mr. Michael Benefield, Mr. Michael
Joffre, and Ms. Melanie Bostwick.
           Does anybody know any of those attorneys that
have appeared on behalf of Stragent?
           Thank you.
           Now I'd like next to turn your attention to my
client, and a number of you said you knew of my client.
Some of you said you had used my client's products.
any of you had bad experiences with my client's products?
          And, Mr. Maddox, I can take it. If you have,
you can tell us.
           Has anybody had bad experiences with Intel's
products?
           Have any of you seen television programs about
Intel or heard radio shows about Intel or seen newspaper
or magazine articles about Intel that you read that have
caused you to form opinions about Intel before today?
you have an opinion about Intel as a corporation?
Anybody have anything like that?
```

with computers, and I just remember sitting on the phone

24

one day for five hours until Hewlett-Packard paid me a hundred dollars to get my money back out of a computer where -- I think there was an invested interest where there was a time bomb going off. Anyway, they paid me back.

MR. JONES: Well, congratulations on your patience and thank you.

And Juror Number 19, Ms. Robinson.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My experience with Intel is just from TV commercials, HSN. I shop on TV and they also speak very highly of Intel products and that's why I bought the computer is through advertisements and I've never had a problem.

MR. JONES: Thank you so much. Thank you.

Now, there had been a mention that, you know, these parties may have been in other lawsuits. There was a mention of that. Does anybody have any knowledge about any lawsuits you've heard about or read about that involve either Intel or involve Stragent? Anybody have any knowledge like that?

I'm going to ask you one of those "do you strongly agree" questions that you just heard before.

And the question is simply this. In a case where a smaller business sues a larger business, I would tend to favor the smaller business. Anybody strongly agree with

```
1
   that question?
2
              Thank you.
3
              Has any one of you had yourself personally or
   had a family member that had a significant dispute, a
4
   time-consuming dispute with a large corporation besides
6
   Hewlett-Packard? Anybody had a significant
   time-consuming dispute?
8
              Yes, sir, Mr. Hurley, Number 20.
9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About a four-month dispute
10
   over warranty claims with a Microsoft product.
11
              MR. JONES:
                          Thank you, sir.
12
              And it would be Juror Number 23, Ms. David.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I don't know if this is --
14
   but it is a large corporation. It was a medical
15
   malpractice suit against a large hospital.
16
              MR. JONES:
                          Okay.
                                  And did you file?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Our family filed.
18
              MR. JONES:
                          Okav.
                                  Thank you, ma'am.
19
              Anybody else?
20
              Thank you so much.
21
              Do any of you have any knowledge, personal
22
   knowledge or knowledge from family or friends, about how
23
   the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office operates?
24
   anybody know anything about the Patent Office?
25
              I believe there was one person that indicated
```

that they had filed or received a patent, which was Juror 2 Number 10, Mr. Gibbs, who --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't. 3 4 MR. JONES: Okay. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A former employer of mine, 6 he filed patents all of the time, just out of a whimsy. He did it a lot. Several were granted to him. know anything about the process. I just know that he got 9 patents. 10 MR. JONES: Is there anything about that that 11 would cause you to lean one way or another in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 12 No. 13 MR. JONES: Has anybody ever been a friend of or had any type of knowledge of a patent examiner? 14 15 Anybody ever received any information from them or somebody that worked with them about, you know, 16 17 how many applications they reviewed or anything like 18 that? 19 Thank you. 20 Now, I'm not going to ask this question, go 21 into any detail about it. I just want to know if it has Have any of you ever been treated 22 occurred. 23 significantly unfairly by an employer? And if you would, just raise your hand. 24

Juror Number 9, Mr. Roark; and we have Juror

```
58
1
   Number 14, Ms. Morris. Thank you.
2
              Anybody else?
3
              And Juror Number 16, Mr. Kimbrell. Thank you.
4
              Now, who in high school, when you were going
5
   through high school -- which of you said, you know, "I
6
   was really good in math and science. Those were the
   subjects I excelled at. They were my best subjects"?
   Which of you could say that?
9
              Okay. Juror Number 10, Mr. Gibbs.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes, sir.
11
              MR. JONES:
                          Juror Number 12, Mr. Leffall.
                                                           \mathsf{Am}
   I saying that right?
12
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Leffall.
14
              MR. JONES:
                          Thank you, sir.
15
              Juror Number 14, Ms. Morris; Juror Number 1,
16
   Ms. Jones.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   7.
                          7. I'm sorry. My eyes are bad.
18
              MR. JONES:
   I apologize. So, that would be Juror Number 7,
19
   Mr. Campbell, Ms. Talbert. I apologize.
20
21
              Juror Number 15. We have Juror Number 17,
22
   Juror Number 21, and Juror Number 24. Thank you so much.
23
              Now, who of you are so good with computers
24
   that your friends and family come to you for advice?
                                                           Who
   would say that about themselves?
25
                                      Anybody?
```

```
59
1
              Mr. Kimbrell, Juror Number 16. All right.
2
   Thank you.
3
              Now, my final two questions -- I think I've
   run out of time, but my final two questions -- well, let
   me ask one other question; and I'll get down to my final
6
         How many of you have ever written a letter to the
   editor on any subject matter or called a radio talk show
   about any subject matter? Anybody ever done that?
9
   done that.
              Mr. Kimbrell, Number 16; Mr. Hurley,
10
11
   Number 20.
12
              Anybody else?
13
              Mr. Roark, Number 9.
14
              Anyone else?
15
              Thank you.
              Okay. Final two questions, probably the most
16
17
   important I'll ask you. Prior to today, has anyone ever
   heard anything about or have any knowledge of any aspect
18
19
   of this case? I mean, is today the first time you've
   ever heard about this case? If so, remain silent.
20
21
   if you say, you know, "I think I've heard something about
22
   this case before we got here today," if that's your
23
   situation, would you raise your hand and tell me about
   it?
24
```

Thank you, ma'am. And Juror Number 23,

25

Yes.

```
Ms. David, let me ask the question very specifically.
2
   Before today you've heard something or received some
3
   information about this particular case?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't remember where I
4
5
   heard it, though.
6
              MR. JONES:
                          Okay.
                                 Thank you, ma'am.
7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just don't remember, but
   I do remember hearing something.
8
9
              MR. JONES:
                                  Do you remember what you
                          Okay.
10
   heard?
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, just that there was --
   I don't remember. I wish I did, but I don't remember
12
13
   where I heard it. It was on the news here somewhere.
14
              MR. JONES:
                          Okav.
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Because I do read the news
   regularly.
16
17
              MR. JONES:
                          Thank you, ma'am.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry.
18
                                               I don't
19
   remember.
20
              MR. JONES:
                          Thank you.
21
              And then the other person that raised their
22
   hand I believe was Juror Number 24, Ms. Walter.
23
   have you heard something about this?
24
                                   Kind of the same way.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
   Something vague in my head. I read headlines a lot and
25
```

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

61 Intel just strikes me and I don't have any opinion about So, I don't remember anything specific. any of those. MR. JONES: Okay. Does that knowledge influence either of you in any way? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, because I don't It seems like it's been awhile since I heard remember. it so... MR. JONES: Thank you. Anybody else? All right. My final question to you would be It's much like what Mr. Albritton just asked you. this. I could stand here all day and probably not get to the right question. But is there any reason, any reason any of you know of that you can't be a fair and impartial, a wise juror for Intel in this case? Any reason any of you know that that I need to know about? Yes, ma'am. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just -- Juror Number 25. I really feel like my brother working with Intel, I would be partial for Intel's side, in all fairness. love to say okay, but I don't know that I can. MR. JONES: I appreciate that. Thank you for your candidness. Thank you for saying that.

Juror Number 24.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: After thinking about something you had said earlier about the claim and would I be able to make a decision based on the fact that a hundred percent of it needed to be the same and why is it 90 percent of it, I don't know that I could be fair with that. MR. JONES: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate your candor. Thank you so much. Anybody else? Anything else I need to know? Yes, sir, Mr. Kimbrell. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Actually, I second her statement. MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you. And you're referring to the statement of Juror Number 24, right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. MR. JONES: Thank you so much. I appreciate your candor. Could the last two jurors clarify THE COURT: what was meant by that answer? I was not clear. MR. JONES: Certainly. Juror Number 24, the court would like you to clarify exactly what you're talking about when you refer to the 99 percent. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, you had discussed that -- the video that we watched earlier, talking about

the patent system and the parts of it that are described

```
as a claim and he had mentioned that we needed to be fair in our decision, that a hundred percent of that would need to be accurate and I don't know that I would -- it was infringed upon -- I guess if it was 90 percent, I would have to vote that way. I don't think it would need to be a hundred percent. If someone stole someone's idea because -- they could get in on a little 10 percent part of it, I would have a problem with that.
```

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

All right. Now we're going to take a recess and -- for the jury panel members, the lawyers have some business to conduct about the final selection of the eight jurors, which is going to take a little while; and the court reporters need a break as well. So, I would like the jurors to return at five minutes of 11:00; and I would like the lawyers to return in ten minutes. Does that give the court reporters enough of a break?

THE REPORTER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. So, we're adjourned for the jurors until five of 11:00; and the lawyers should be back in ten minutes.

(Recess, 10:24 a.m. to 10:37 a.m.)

(Open court, all parties present, prospective

jurors not present.)

THE COURT: We'll first address the cause issues; and then as the lawyers requested, I'll give you a break for a few minutes to consider the peremptory challenges.

So, I propose to excuse Jurors 16, 24, 25, and 26 for cause. Is there any objection to that?

MR. ALBRITTON: We have no objection to those, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: We have no objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Are there others that you believe should be excused for cause. Mr. Albritton?

MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, your Honor. I believe that we agree -- Intel and the plaintiff agree that Number 9 should likewise be stricken for cause.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 9 will be stricken for cause.

MR. ALBRITTON: And then, your Honor, we've got two additional that we think should be stricken for cause. Number 3 -- Juror Number 3 indicated that he was pretty sure his mutual fund owned Intel stock; and for that reason, we would move to strike 3 for cause.

And then Number 23 was not as firm on that point but believed that possibly her mutual -- let me see

```
if I can get the gender right here -- that her mutual fund likewise included Intel stock.
```

So, we would move on 3 and 23 as well, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: Your Honor, first with regard to the issue of Juror Number 9, we do agree to that.

With regard to issue number 3 -- with regard to Juror Number 3 and also Juror Number 23, I think their situations are both the same. I mean, my memory is not exact; but what they said is "Our mutual funds may own Intel stock. We don't" -- I think one of them may have said, "I think it does." Judge, that showed no influence that that would have upon them. There was no question asked them of "Will this in any way influence your decision?" They didn't intimate that it would, and I don't think there is any reason to excuse them for cause.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, with respect to judges, the fact that you own a mutual fund which includes a particular stock isn't grounds for recusal.

21 I'm not sure why it should be any different for a juror.

What's your reaction to that, Mr. Albritton?

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor.

Well, of course, as the court knows, if they own stock outright, it would be an automatic

disqualifier.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ALBRITTON: And frankly, 23 is less problematic from our perspective than Number 3. The fact that Number 3 said that he was pretty sure that it owned stock, that would lead to a bias in favor of Intel. It's not just that there is -- as I understand it with judicial ethics -- and you would certainly know this better than I.

THE COURT: Yeah, I would.

MR. ALBRITTON: That's not the only thing you know better than I, I'm quite certain.

But it's -- you know, I think it's a slightly different situation because, of course, the judicial officers are well versed in all of these issues. We've got here a lay juror who's pretty certain or believes pretty firmly that his mutual fund has stock and therefore could believe that a verdict in this case could impact his mutual fund portfolio and for that reason we would ask -- we would move on 23. And I will withdraw my request as it relates to -- I'm sorry --

THE COURT: Other way around.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ ALBRITTON: Yes, sir. We withdraw on 23, and we urge on 3.

THE COURT: All right. I'll excuse 3 for

```
67
1
   cause.
2
              So, that would be 3, 9, 16, 24, 25, and 26.
3
              Is there anybody -- any other for-cause
   issues?
4
5
              MR. JONES:
                          No, your Honor.
                                            Excuse me.
6
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                  I want to mention that I
   propose to include one additional instruction as a result
   of the jury questioning in the preliminary instructions,
   and it would be this: The object of a damages award is
   to compensate, not to punish. You should not award
10
11
   increased damages because the patent was used without
12
   permission.
13
              Is there any objection to that?
14
              MR. ALBRITTON: Certainly not, your Honor.
15
              MR. JONES:
                          No, your Honor.
16
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Anything else that we need
17
   to talk about before we adjourn so you can do your
18
   peremptories?
19
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Not on behalf of the
   plaintiff, your Honor.
20
21
              THE COURT:
                          How long do you need to do that?
22
                          Could we have 15 minutes, your
              MR. JONES:
23
   Honor?
24
              THE COURT:
                          Why don't you try to do it in ten
25
   because the jury is going to be coming back at five of,
```

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
68
```

```
and I'd like to do the preliminary instructions and the
opening statements before we break for lunch.
                                              So, let's
get it in ten minutes. Okay?
           MR. JONES:
                      Thank you, your Honor.
           THE COURT:
                       Okay.
           (Recess, 10:42 a.m. to 10:55 a.m.)
           (Open court, all parties present, prospective
jurors not present.)
           THE COURT:
                       Before the jury comes back in, I
just want to make sure that I've got these numbers right
with the hardship excuses and the excuses for cause and
the peremptories. The jurors that I have will be 1, 2,
7, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 19.
           Is that correct?
           MR. ALBRITTON: I guess I'm a little bit
           Number 4 wasn't -- I apologize, your Honor.
confused.
Could you...
          THE COURT: I have 1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 17, 18,
and 19.
          MR. ALBRITTON:
                          Those -- I'm sorry. Those
represent --
           THE COURT:
                      Those would be the jurors who
would be seated. You may not know. I mean, this
includes the peremptories.
           MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir. I mean, the way I
```

```
had counted it based on when we left, we were striking
2
   through 20. And the ones that had previously been
3
   excused were 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, and 16, which were in the
   strike zone. Those are the ones that had been excused
4
5
   for either cause or --
6
              THE COURT: I'm not sure what you're saying.
7
   Are you saying that Number 4 should be on the list?
8
              MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir. What I understood
   was that the jurors from which we were striking were
   Number 1, Number 2, Number 4, Number 7, Number 8,
10
11
   Number 10, Number 12, Number 13, Number 14, Number 15,
   17, 18, 19, and 20, were the ones that we would be
12
13
   striking, considering that there were a total of six --
14
                          No, I'm not reading the ones that
              THE COURT:
15
   are on the list before the strikes. I'm reading the list
   after the strikes.
16
17
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              0h.
                                    I'm sorry.
18
              THE COURT: All right. These are the eight
19
   jurors --
20
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Okay.
              THE COURT: -- the ones that I listed.
21
22
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                              Okav.
23
              THE COURT: Am I doing anything wrong?
24
                              No, sir. You're right.
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                                                        I'm
25
   confused.
              What were those numbers one more time?
```

70 1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 19. 1 THE COURT: 2 Obviously I don't know their MR. JONES: preliminary strikes; but I have no reason to believe 3 4 that's incorrect, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. ALBRITTON: That appears -- the same, your 7 Honor, yes. 8 THE COURT: All right. So, is the jury ready 9 to come back in? 10 Let's bring them in. 11 (Prospective jurors enter the courtroom, 10:59 a.m.) 12 13 THE COURT: Thank you very much, ladies and 14 We worked hard with the lawyers on the jury 15 selection while you were gone, and one of the effects of 16 that work is that we have chosen the jury. And for those 17 who are not selected, we very much appreciate the time that you have spent down here today. 18 19 And I just want to reiterate two points that I 20 made earlier. One is that there is no reflection on you 21 if you were not chosen. That's just part of the process. 22 And the second is that regardless of whether you're 23 chosen or not chosen, your service here today is extremely important and we're grateful, very grateful for 24

your having participated in it and it's a very impressive

```
panel of jurors and we appreciate your coming here.
2
              Now the time has come to select the jurors.
3
   I'm going to read the numbers of the eight jurors who
   have been selected, and they should take their place in
   the jury box. Mr. Blanton will show you where to sit,
6
   and the rest of the jurors will be excused.
7
              Juror Number 1, please stand and take your
8
   place in the jury box.
9
              Juror Number 2, please stand and take your
   place in the jury box.
10
11
              Next is Juror Number 7. Please stand and take
12
   your place in the jury box.
13
              Juror Number 12, please stand and take your
14
   place in the jury box.
15
              Juror Number 13, please stand and take your
   place in the jury box.
16
17
              Juror Number 17, please stand and take your
18
   place in the jury box.
19
              Juror Number 18, please stand and take your
20
   place in the jury box.
21
              And Juror Number 19, please stand and take
22
   your place in the jury box.
23
              Okay. Thank you.
24
              Does counsel have any objections to the jury
   that's been selected?
25
```

MR. ALBRITTON: No, your Honor.

MR. JONES: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

All right. Well, for the remainder of the jurors who were not selected, again we thank you and your time has not been wasted today. This was a very smooth jury selection. Often we require many more than are ultimately selected and the court thanks you and you're free to go now.

(Remaining prospective jurors exit the courtroom, 11:03 a.m.)

THE COURT: Ms. Ferguson, would you administer the oath, please.

(The oath is administered to the jury.)

THE COURT: Now I'm going to begin with preliminary instructions, which is a brief description of the case and the law that governs. And then each side will have half an hour for opening statements in which they will describe their view of what the case is and then we'll adjourn for lunch for an hour and we will begin with the witness testimony immediately after lunch.

Now, you've been sworn in now as jurors in this case; and at the end of the trial it's going to be your job to decide the facts based on the evidence you heard and saw. I'll give you instructions on the law and

the procedure that you should follow in making your decision, but I don't decide the facts. That is your job.

The first phase of the trial, as I mentioned, will be the opening arguments in which the lawyers will preview the case and prepare you for the evidence which is the main phase of the trial. And then the witnesses will first be called by Stragent as part of its case and then Intel as the defendant being sued will present its case and after the Intel case is concluded, Stragent will have the opportunity to present rebuttal evidence. Then there will be closing arguments and final instructions, and then you will be asked to go and deliberate and reach a verdict and come back and tell us what the verdict is.

As I've mentioned, we hope to be able to conclude this by Friday; but we may have to ask you to come in on Saturday or even next week to conclude it.

As I've mentioned before and it has been mentioned several times, Stragent is the plaintiff.

Intel is the defendant. This means that Stragent accuses Intel of infringing its patents. There are three patent claims that are involved here. I'll explain in a minute what a patent claim is.

Intel has offered two defenses. First it asserts it is not infringing Stragent's patents; that is,

that it does not come within the claims of the patent.

And second, it asserts that the Stragent patent claims are invalid. And you're going to hear evidence about both issues, infringement and invalidity; and you're going to be asked to reach a verdict on both infringement and invalidity based on the evidence that you receive.

Now, what do I mean by "evidence"? The evidence in this case will consist of sworn testimony from live witnesses, deposition testimony -- that is, videotaped deposition testimony -- from witnesses who are unable to be here; written exhibits that are received into evidence; and stipulations reached by the lawyers for the parties.

The substitute for live witness testimony, the deposition testimony, should be treated exactly the same as live witness testimony. Exhibits are simply documents that the parties are introducing into evidence which you may consider. And a stipulation is a stipulation of fact agreed to by both sides. And if the parties have agreed that a fact is true, stipulated to it, you should accept it as true and think nothing more of it.

Now, one important last thing about evidence is the statements and the arguments that the lawyers make are not evidence; and this includes the opening and closing statements as well as any of the questions that

are made to the witnesses. The lawyers' statements are not evidence.

Now, evidence has to be admitted in order for you to consider it. When I mean "admitted into evidence" or "received into evidence," I mean that you may consider a particular statement or a particular exhibit in making a decision at the end of the case. And you may only consider the evidence that is admitted. Some evidence will be excluded by me, and you may not consider that.

Now, in addition to the evidence that is received, you may draw inferences from the facts that have been proven and reasonable inferences or conclusions are permissible.

From time to time during the trial, one or the other party may object to the introduction of evidence and I will rule on those objections and I will either say that the evidence should be admitted or not admitted. But you shouldn't infer by the rulings that I make that I have any opinions on the facts of the case or that I favor one side or the other. If I overrule an objection, I am permitting the evidence to be introduced; and you should not think anything of the fact that it was objected to. You shouldn't attribute any weight to that. It could be excluded for any number of reasons, and it is

not your task to worry about that.

Sometimes I will allow evidence to be admitted only for a limited purpose and not others, and you should consider it only for the purpose that I allow it to be considered for. It's conceivable also that sometimes evidence might come in and then be stricken later. And if that happens, if the evidence is stricken, you also can't consider that evidence.

Now, during the trial it may be necessary for me to confer with the lawyers outside of your hearing, as I consulted with the lawyers in the process of jury selection. I will handle these matters as briefly and conveniently for you as I can, but they are a necessary part of the trial. And it's also my duty to warn or caution a lawyer who does something in open court in front of the jury that's not in keeping with the rules of evidence or procedures, and don't draw any evidence -- any inference against a party if I have occasion to caution a lawyer during the trial.

Now, it's very important to keep an open mind during the trial. Don't decide any fact until you've heard all of the evidence, the closing arguments, and my instructions. At the end of the trial, as I mentioned, you'll recess and deliberate to make a decision based on the evidence that you've heard. The exhibits, the written documents that are introduced as exhibits, will

be available to you during deliberations; and even though the court reporters here are making a transcript of the trial, the witness testimony, that will not be available to you during the deliberations.

Now, it is possible for you to ask during your deliberations to have a limited portion of the testimony read back to you. It's difficult and time-consuming for the reporters to do that. So, the opportunity to have testimony read back is limited; and it is very important for that reason to pay very close attention to the testimony when it is given.

Now, until this case is over, you cannot discuss the case with anyone and you cannot allow anyone to discuss the case with you. This includes family and friends, the parties, the witnesses, the lawyers, anyone. And if anyone should try to discuss the case with you or approach you about the case, you should inform me immediately; and I'll take appropriate measures.

Now, don't even, in fact, discuss this case with your fellow jurors during the trial until you recess for the deliberations at the end of the trial. So, even with respect to fellow jurors, don't discuss the case until the end of the trial.

And it's particularly important that the trial lawyers are not allowed to speak with you during the

case. When you see them or pass them in the halls, in general they won't speak to you. They may say "good morning," which is okay; but they are not being rude in not having a broader conversation than that. That's simply my instructions to the lawyers. And you should not say anything to them, either, other than nodding and saying "good morning."

The lawyers are also not allowed to speak with you after the case is over except in exceptional circumstances, and they would have to secure permission from me to do that. You can speak to anyone else about the case when it's over, but you should not speak to the lawyers involved in the case unless I give permission.

Now, many of you undoubtedly use social networks such as *Facebook* or *Twitter*. Do not discuss, post updates of any kind regarding the trial of this case or your views about it. You can tell your friends and family about the case when it's over with.

Likewise, do not send any text messages or e-mails about the case or discuss it with anyone. I want you to leave your cell phones or any other electronic devices in the jury room during the trial, not to bring them into the courtroom. You may use them during lunch break or recesses to call your family, not to discuss the case but to say, you know, "I'll be home for dinner a

little bit late because the trial is going a little bit later." But do that in the jury room. Do not bring those electronic devices, please, into the courtroom.

You're also not allowed to do any research into any fact or issue related to the case. You shouldn't go on the Internet to learn more about the case, the parties, the lawyers, or patents. Do not watch or read any news accounts of the trial should you run across them. And the reason for all of this is that you're supposed to be guided by what you see and hear in the courtroom, and this is a very important part of our civil justice system. If two parties disagree, they can bring their dispute here and be assured that the jury is going to resolve it based on the evidence that is heard in court.

Now, we have juror notebooks for you; and I'm going to ask Ms. Ferguson to distribute to you the juror notebooks now. We'll pause for just a moment, and then I'll explain what is in the notebooks.

(Juror notebooks are distributed to the jury.)

THE COURT: Okay. You all have your notebooks. Let's just briefly go through what's in here. As I mentioned, there are two patents involved; and they are these long numbers. 6,848,072 is one patent. We'll refer to that and the parties will refer to that as the

"'072 patent."

There is the second patent which is the 7,028,244 patent; and again for convenience, the lawyers and I will refer to that as the "'244 patent."

Now, there are only three claims of those patents that are at issue in the case; and if you look at the next tab, you will see something that's called "List of Asserted Claims and Court's Construction of Claim Terminology." The claims are in the left-hand column. There are three of them. The first one you see is claim 12, and there is claim 16. Those are both in the '072 patent. And then there is claim 1 of the '244 patent.

And you'll see in the right-hand column is the court's construction of various terms that appear in the patent. That's the process of what we call "claim construction" where the parties have urged their views of how the claim terms should be construed and the court has ruled on those constructions. And, so, you see in the right-hand column is the court's construction. So, there is the term "CRC circuit" is in the claim; and there is the court's construction. In other words, it's sort of like a dictionary that tells you what you should understand that particular term to mean in the patent.

And then there is the next item which is

glossary -- it says "Proposed Glossary of Patent Terms," and that is to aid you also in understanding certain other patent terminology that is used here.

There is, following that, a list of the plaintiff's witnesses with pictures and a place for you to take notes about their testimony. And then the next one is defendant's witnesses. They will similarly supply pictures and sheets relating to their witnesses. You'll get that at the conclusion of the plaintiff's case.

And then there is a tab for jury questions.

I'll explain that in a minute. And then there is -should be some note paper for you to take notes at the
end of that.

And at the end of each day, you'll leave those notebooks with the court; and at the end of the trial, the notes that you keep will be destroyed.

Now, don't feel that you have to take notes.

If you wish to take notes, there is a place for you to do it; but don't take so many notes about the testimony that you don't pay attention to what the witnesses are actually saying.

All right. Now -- I mentioned one of the tabs related to jury questions. Normally during trials only the lawyers are allowed to ask questions of the witnesses. However, in this case I'm going to ask you as

jurors to ask questions if you think it is necessary and appropriate. And the way this will work is to have a process so that the lawyers and I cannot tell which jurors are asking questions. If there is something that you would like to ask -- the questions will come at the end of each witness' testimony. And if there is a question you would like to have asked of that witness, you should write it down on a sheet and pass it to our courtroom deputy. And at the end of each witness' testimony, each of you should hand forward a sheet even if you don't have a question. And the reason for that is so that no one can tell who asked the question. So, you don't have to ask a question; but you should pass along a sheet even if you don't ask a question.

When you hand in the questions, I'll review them, if there are any; and I'll determine which ones should be asked. Now, don't be offended if I decide not to ask your question. There could be all sorts of reasons for that. Don't worry about it. If I do ask the question, I may reframe it to make it a little bit different.

And after I've asked the question to the witness or questions to the witness, then the lawyers may have an opportunity to ask a few follow-up questions.

Now, as I said, don't feel compelled to ask questions;

but don't be afraid to ask a question if you think it's important and would be helpful.

Now, let's talk a little bit about patents. You've seen the video on the topic. As you probably know by now, patents are granted to individual inventors by the Patent and Trademark Office which is referred to in the course of the trial as the "PTO." And in order to get a patent, the inventor files an application with the PTO. Then there is someone called an "examiner" who is an expert in the field who reviews the patent application and decides ultimately whether a patent should be granted.

The patent allows its holder to prevent others from making, using, or selling the patented invention. The patent also prevents others from offering the patented invention for sale or importing it into the United States. And when somebody does one of those things without the patent owner's permission -- that is without a license from the patent owner. You'll hear about patent licenses during the course of the trial. When someone does that without permission, without a license, that's called "infringement." And the patent holder can enforce the patent against infringers by suing them in federal court, and that's what Stragent claims has happened here. They claim that Intel has infringed

the patent.

On the other hand, everyone has the right to use existing knowledge and principles. A patent cannot remove from the public the ability to use what was known or obvious before the invention was made or protection was sought. And if a patent issues that is invalid, you cannot sue to recover infringement damages. Not every patent that is granted by the Patent and Trademark Office is a valid patent, and part of your job is to determine whether the patent claims here are valid claims.

Now, the process of obtaining a patent is called "prosecution." To start the process, as I mentioned, the claimed inventor files an application. The examiners review the application. The application includes a part called the "specification" -- I'll show you in a few minutes what part of the patent is called the "specification" -- which contains a written description of the invention and tells what the invention is, how it works, how to make it and use it; and that's supposed to be done in full, clear, and exact terms so that others who are competitors can know what is covered by the patent.

And at the end of the patent, there are patent claims. Now, for each of these patents there are quite a large number of claims at the end of the patent. We're

only concerned with three of them; and those three are the ones that are in your book there, claims 12 and 16 of the '072 patent and claim 1 of the '244 patent. So, we're only dealing with three claims. You don't have to worry about the others.

Now, the invalidity issue relates to what's called "prior art." Prior art is defined by law -- at a later time I'll give you a specific instruction about what prior art. In general prior art includes earlier patents, things that existed before the claimed invention that were publicly known or used in this country or that were described in the printed publication.

Now, the examiners at the Patent Office consider prior art when they are determining whether to issue a patent and the examiner considers what's called "cited references" which are listed in the patent and those consist of prior references found by the examiner, him or herself, or that were found by the applicant and submitted to the PTO.

The process by which a patent is granted is a process that takes place only between the applicant and the patent examiner. It's what's called "ex parte."

Competitors who might be affected by the patent are not part of that process. It's solely between the patent applicant and the examiner. And they go back and forth

for some time in deciding whether the patent should be granted, and the papers that are generated in the process of going back and forth to see what claims of the patent should be granted are called the "prosecution history."

You'll hear about that prosecution history of the patent, the record of the process by which it was granted in the first place.

If the patent is granted, the claims define the boundaries of the protection, give notice to the public about these boundaries. The creation of a patent and granting of a patent by the PTO does carry with it a presumption that the patent is valid. It's presumed that the subject matter of the patent is new, useful, and constitutes an advance that was not at the time of the invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In other words, the examiner has concluded that this is a valid patent.

But as I mentioned earlier, just because the examiner or the PTO decides that a patent should be issued and is valid doesn't necessarily mean that this was correct, that an invention claimed in the patent was, in fact, legally entitled to protection. One or more of the claims, in fact, maybe should not have been issued and they are not valid claims.

A person accused of infringement has the right

to argue here in federal court that a claimed invention of the patent is not entitled to patent protection because it does not meet the requirements for a patent. In other words, an accused infringer may defend a suit for patent infringement on the grounds that the patent claim is invalid.

Here Intel asserts that the three claims that are before us are not valid, and it is your job to consider the evidence presented by the parties and determine whether Intel has proven that the claims are not valid. And it has to do that by clear and convincing evidence.

Now, to help you follow the evidence, I'm going to give you a brief summary of the positions of the parties. The case involves those two patents, the '072 patent and the '244 patent obtained by Walter Milliken; and they have been obtained by Stragent through a series of transactions that were referenced earlier in the course of the jury selection.

Stragent alleges that Intel has infringed claims 12 and 16. These are what are called "product claims." They are claims to a product. They've infringed by making, using, selling or offering to sell and importing products that include all of the requirements of those claims.

Stragent also contends that Intel has infringed claim 1 of the '244 patent. That is not a product claim; that is called a "method claim." It's a method which can be patented as well as a product.

And as I mentioned before, Intel asserts that each of these three claims that are before us are invalid. And you must decide, as part of your task, whether these three claims have been infringed and whether they are valid or invalid claims.

Now, if you decide that any asserted claim has been infringed and is not invalid, you will then need to decide any money damages to be awarded to Stragent to compensate for that infringement. And it's important to understand that the object of the damages award if you find infringement is not to punish. It's to compensate. It's not punishment. And you should not award any increased damages, if you find any, just because the patent was used without permission. The same royalty -- reasonable royalty that we're trying to determine would be paid whether the patent was used with permission or without permission.

Now, we've been through the jury notebooks; but I'd like to just focus you for a moment on the '072 patent just to explain to you a little bit what the patent looks like. You'll see the patent number if you

look at the first page here. There is the date that the patent issued which is January 25th, 2005. The inventor is Walter Clark Milliken. You see that over on the left-hand side. And then there is the initial assignee which was BBN Solutions. As I mentioned, it is now owned by Stragent.

And then there is an Abstract on the front page there. That's a brief discussion of what the patent is, a brief statement of what the patent is. And there are various figures, figures in the first part of the patent which set forth information relevant to the invention. And then what I mentioned as the "specification" begins right after the figures. You see these various columns which are numbered here, and the line numbers in the specification are numbered for ease of reference.

And then at the end in Column 6 begins these list of claims, and for this patent you only need to focus on the claims that are numbered 12 and 16.

Now, the claims of the patent are the main focus in this trial because, as I mentioned before, the claims are what define the patent owner's rights under the law; that is, the claims define what the patent owner may exclude others from doing during the term of the patent; and the claims of a patent in this respect serve

two purposes. They define the boundaries of what the invention covers, and they provide notice to other people of what's covered by the claims.

When a patent or method is accused of infringement as here, what you do is compare the accused product or method to determine whether there is infringement; and that's determined by looking at the claims and the claim language and the court's construction of the claim terms and compare those to the accused products or method.

And the claims are also important in deciding whether the patent is invalid; and, so, for both purposes of infringement and invalidity, you'll be looking at the claims and the interpretations that have been given to the claims.

When the claims come up, as I mentioned earlier, they may be -- the parties may have different interpretations of them. The interpretations of the claims is a matter for the court and as I mentioned, the court has provided constructions of disputed claim terminology here and you have in your books the construction that the court has given to those claims. And the parties and their experts are required to use those constructions when presenting evidence, and you must also accept and apply them when you decide the

issues of infringement and invalidity.

Now I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the burden of proof. The burden of proof says which side has the burden and what the burden is to convince you of infringement or invalidity. The standard of proof tells you how strong the evidence has to be to persuade you. And in this case the burdens of proof are different depending on the issue.

First, Stragent, being the patent holder and plaintiff, has the burden of proving that Intel has infringed the patents; and it has to do so by what's called a "preponderance of the evidence" and that means it has to show that it was more probable than not that Intel infringes. If you think that the evidence of infringement is evenly balanced, Intel wins. On the other hand, if you think that the evidence favors infringement, then Stragent wins on that issue. And Stragent also bears the burden of proving damages on infringement by a preponderance of the evidence.

Now, on the other hand, a different standard of proof applies to invalidity; and that's, as I mentioned earlier, the clear and convincing evidence standard. That's a higher burden of proof to prove invalidity. And clear and convincing evidence is evidence that produces in your mind a firm belief or

conviction that the claim or defense has been proven. Clear and convincing evidence, while higher than preponderance of the evidence, is not as high as the beyond a reasonable doubt standard that is used in criminal cases. And in deciding whether the burden of proof has been satisfied, you must consider all of the evidence presented by both sides.

Now, a final matter. I need to emphasize to you that violating the court's instructions that I give you would be a very serious matter. As you can imagine, a great deal of time, effort, and money has gone into getting this case ready for trial and to trying it fairly and impartially before you. If you were to violate the court's instructions, it could place all of that work in jeopardy; and we might have to go back and do it all over again. So, please follow my instructions to the best of your ability.

Now, that concludes my preliminary instructions. We're now going to have opening statements. But before we do that, I just wanted to ask Mr. Albritton and Mr. Campbell if there are any objections to the instructions that the court has given.

MR. ALBRITTON: No, your Honor.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

So, Mr. Albritton -MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, we would like to

3 invoke the rule of witnesses.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you.

THE COURT: And what that means is that witnesses who are going to testify in the case should not sit in the courtroom before their testimony and they should not discuss with anyone the testimony that was given by other witnesses before they took the stand, with the exception of expert witnesses.

MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir. And company representatives as well.

THE COURT: And company representatives.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your

Honor.

1

2

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Albritton, you can go first.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your

20 Honor.

May it please the court, counsel.

Good morning. I want to tell you first off thank you very much. Thank you on behalf of myself and on behalf of Stragent and its owners, Kevin Zilka and Leslie Novy and Jason Player, and also on behalf of Barry

Bumgardner and Jaime Olin. We appreciate this. We understand that this is inconvenient. It's the week of spring break; so, I understand there are probably places lots of you would rather be than here and we appreciate you coming.

I agree wholeheartedly with my friend Mike Jones. This is a very important case. It's a very important case to my client as well as to Intel.

Ladies and gentlemen, what you're going to learn is that Walter Milliken was working at a company called BBN Technologies and Walter Milliken invented a fast and flexible way for computer chips, for processors to do CRC error detection. Walter Milliken is the first person in the world who came up with the idea that you should use two CRC circuits, each with its own hardwired polynomial and an instruction.

Intel, ladies and gentlemen, is using these patents, these patents right here which were granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office that cover Mr. Milliken's inventions.

Intel is using these patented inventions without permission, and it's doing so by selling server processors that offer the ability to use what they call "rolling 16-bit CRC error detection."

I want to take you back in time. I want to

take you back to the summer of 2000. Walter Milliken was working for a company called "BBN." BBN is a company that is located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and some of our country's very brightest people work there and they work to solve some of the world's most complicated problems. BBN, you're going to learn, has a long and storied history. BBN is the subject of a book called "Where Wizards Work [sic] Late." "Where Wizards Work [sic] Late." "Where Wizards ARPANET, which we now know today as the Internet.

BBN's contributions to our country's technology is so significant that just last year, in 2013, it received our nation's highest honor, the National Medal of Technology and Innovation.

So, what's going on in 2000? Walter Milliken and his colleagues at BBN started to work on a device, an Internet router. And what an Internet router is, it's a device that sends data over from one computer to the next. Well, one of the problems you have with an Internet router is that when data goes back and forth, it can get corrupted. There can be errors. That exact same problem happens not just over from computer to computer but also inside computers, when one processor is talking to another processor.

Walter Milliken invented this technology. The

Patent Office gave these two patents we're here about today; and Stragent, a small company over in Longview, owns them. The router that Mr. Milliken and his colleagues were working on was extremely sophisticated. There was nothing like it in the entire world. And when Mr. Milliken and his colleagues sat down to work on this project, he pretty quickly discovered that there was not any processor on the market that would do what he needed.

Now, some of you are sophisticated with computers more than others. But a processor is also called a "CPU." A processor or a CPU, it's the brains. It's the brains of many types of electronic devices, whether it be a server, your desktop computer at home, or a laptop computer.

But the processor that Mr. Milliken went out to design was -- and that he invented was a processor that could work in many types of devices. This project originally was an Internet router project, but he came up with a invention that applies to and is used by many different types of processor technology.

So, the first thing I need to talk to you about -- and his Honor mentioned it, and I have to confess I practiced it -- it's about cyclic redundancy checks.

Now, I'm pretty sure that none of y'all talk

about cyclic redundancy checks in your everyday life. I certainly do not. Well, cyclic redundancy checks is a particular way of doing this, are what this case is about. We're going to refer to it as "CRC" so we don't have to spit out the whole phrase every time.

What Mr. Milliken invented and was the first one in the world to invent was the idea, a better way, a faster and more flexible way to do CRC error detection. He decided that you needed to use two hardwired -- I'm sorry -- two separate CRC circuits, each with its own hardwired polynomial. Now, a polynomial is -- that's what's used to do the mathematical computations -- with an instruction as to which circuit to use. The first person. And the United States Patent and Trademark Office awarded these two patents that cover those important inventions.

In today's world, more so than in the past, you've got lots of data going back and forth. One way, of course, is data going between one group of computers and another group of computers like in the context of the Internet. But what you also have is you have data going between individual processors in large server systems.

Now, a server, as you may know, it's just a group of big computers that have got lots of different processors that talk to each other and store enormous amounts of data,

important data, data that relates to our everyday lives.

Let me give an example. I live in Longview and I bank at BancorpSouth and I actually do online banking. So, when I log in to do my online banking, my computer is talking to the servers in Tupelo,

Mississippi. Okay? Those servers are -- you have processors among those servers talking to each other, sending data back and forth and also data is being sent to me. And there is a chance that you can start getting mistakes, and those can have real consequences in your lives.

For instance, you go and you deposit a 500-dollar check into your bank account. Corrupted data can make that deposit show up as a 50-dollar deposit. So, it's important, ladies and gentlemen, that you have CRC error detection that works fast and that is flexible to prevent against those problems.

Intel, ladies and gentlemen, their processors, the processors that are used in servers that are in issue in this case, send that data back and forth; and they use Walter Milliken's inventions to check for and detect those errors and they do it by using -- and I want you to make note of this -- by using something -- by offering something called "rolling 16-bit CRC."

What you're going to learn during the course

of the trial, ladies and gentlemen, is you can do 8-bit CRC and you can do what's called "rolling 16-bit CRC."

By using the inventions of -- these inventions, Intel can make and sell processors that can do both. It gives flexibility to the customers. And that's important because there is a trade-off. 16 bit is more safe -- it detects more errors -- whereas 8 is slightly faster. And by using these patents, ladies and gentlemen, Intel gives its customers the ability to determine which is more important for their particular needs.

I want to walk you through a timeline of some important events just to put the whole case in context. What you're going to learn is that there was this project at BBN called an "iRouter project," and it started in the summer of 2000. Then in September of 2000, Walter Milliken and BBN filed a provisional patent application, which is the type of patent application allowed by the Patent Office rules and by the law. It's a more -- a smaller version. They then filed the ultimate -- the patent application, the full one, in September of 2001. And there are two patents, but I'm going to talk about one just for simplicity's sake.

It was filed in September of 2001. In January, 2005, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued that '072 patent.

Fast-forward a number of years. BBN then sells those patents to Stragent, which is the plaintiff in this case, and is helping BBN get due compensation for the infringement by Intel.

And then you're going to see, lo and behold, years later -- what are we talking, four years or better after the patent issued -- Intel starts selling products, making money using the patents that were invented by Walter Milliken.

What I've done -- and I hope that the other side does this as well -- is I've put up on the screen exactly what you have in your juror notebook. The only difference is you see that number "1," "2," "3," and "4." I added those, just so we can see that there are four elements of this claim.

As I told you, there are more than one claim involved; but I'm going to focus on claim 16. What's important about this is his Honor told you in very clear terms this patent claim defines the scope of the invention. So, what you have to do, ladies and gentlemen, is go through and decide does each of these elements -- the Number 1, the Number 2, the Number 3, and the Number 4 -- do they show up in Intel's products. And if they do, that means there is infringement.

But there is something else very, very

important on this chart; and it's the hard work of his Honor, Judge Dyk. It's the court's constructions. Because some of those words don't have meaning to lay folks like you and me. And, so, his Honor says that these words have special meaning; and they have to be applied by me, by Mr. Campbell, and by you.

If you notice, one other thing, here at the top it says "a device comprising." That's what we're here to talk about, ladies and gentlemen. The device at issue in this case is Intel's server processors. It's not a specific -- and this claim applies to lots of different types of processors so long as they have elements 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Now, you heard this invention originally came out of a project that dealt with an Internet router. This invention is not limited to any specific type of processor like a network processor, for instance. And if anybody suggests that to you, that's just wrong because if you read this, ladies and gentlemen, the word "network processor" shows up nowhere in that claim.

This claim is to a device, and the device at issue in this case are the Intel server processors because you will see the Intel server processors have each of those four elements.

Now, how are we going to go about, ladies and

gentlemen, proving this to you? Because that's my burden and I accept it very enthusiastically. What we're going to do is we're going to call an expert by the name of Dr. Harold Stone. Dr. Stone has spent literally hundreds of hours pouring over the patents in this case and the related documents and, importantly, Intel's own secret internal documents, both its written documents but also something called "source code." Source code is the secret sauce. It's the computer code that's used to make these chips.

And what you're going to hear is that ultimately what's at issue is the chips that are sold, but also when they are made they are made into something called a "wafer." A wafer has got the individual circuits on them. They then cut those chips up, package them, and sell them. The dye, the little circuitry on the wafers and the chips infringe, the final package chips. And Dr. Stone is going to walk you through it specifically by showing you Intel document after Intel document and by showing you Intel code after Intel code.

It's going to be important -- and I ask you to consider it. Listen to what Dr. Stone says but also listen to his experience because that's going to help you decide is this a man who knows about these issues. And I ask you to do the same thing with respect to Intel's

witnesses.

What you're going to learn about Dr. Stone is he has a PhD in electrical engineering. He's been a professor of computer science and electrical engineering. He's an author. In fact, you're going to see this book right here (demonstrating). Chapter 5 is a chapter specifically about error detection and error coding.

This book (demonstrating), another book written by Dr. Stone, deals with the design of processors, the very issues that this case is about.

Dr. Stone is going to rely on this document in part. It's an Intel top-secret document that talks about the accused products. And he's going to walk you through pages, and I'm just going to give you some examples.

This is a page that shows two CRC circuits. This is a

page that talks about the demultiplexer of the -- another page that talks about the demultiplexer.

This one talks about that fourth limitation, parallel decomposition.

And what you're going to see, ladies and gentlemen, by looking at the documents Dr. Stone shows you and the code, internal Intel code, I respectfully suggest to you that you're going to conclude that element 1, element 2, element 3, and element 4 are in the devices at issue in this case, the Intel server processors as

included on those wafers when they are made and then in those final package chips as they are sold. What this means, ladies and gentlemen, is that Intel infringes.

Next we're going to call an expert named

Dr. Chris Vellturo. Dr. Vellturo is a damages expert.

He's an expert economist. Dr. Vellturo is highly

regarded and, in fact, you're going to learn has worked

as an expert for these folks (indicating). He previously

worked as an expert for Intel.

Dr. Vellturo is going to go through the internal documents of Intel and he's going to talk about them and he's going to talk about them in the context of his experience.

This is a document, for instance, he's going to show you, ladies and gentlemen. Remember the chips involved here have rolling 16-bit CRC. Okay? And they do that because they've got two CRC circuits, each with its hardwired polynomial and an instruction. This document is an internal Intel document that talks about some features that they call "RAS," R-A-S. Those are real important features in server process. This document shows you that the third most important, Number 3 out of 19, is actually the rolling 16-bit CRC.

Dr. Vellturo is going to also go through and he's going to look at some prior agreements between

Stragent, the company that owns these patents, and two companies that used to -- that infringe. Those two companies have entered into license agreements. Now, they were sued, okay, much like Intel is sued in this case. They ultimately settled and took responsibility for their actions, and they paid money for their previous use and for all of their expected future use. Dr. Vellturo -- that's an amount of money, revenue, for their past infringement and their expecting future use.

Dr. Vellturo relied on that and says that -- and you'll see it comes out to about a little over 1 percent to about 2 percent is what those other two companies paid. And, so, Dr. Vellturo has taken that, and he's going to tell you in this case that for every dollar -- this is a hundred pennies -- every dollar that Intel makes selling chips that are made or sold in the United States that use these patents that came from BBN and Mr. Milliken, one penny of it should go to extra and then to BBN.

And, so, what does Intel say about that?

Well, ladies and gentlemen, if you take 1 percent -- or it's actually slightly more, 1.18 -- and you multiply that by how much money Intel has made, it's a lot of money. Intel, you're going to hear -- it's agreed to by the parties -- in a little over 2 years Intel has made

\$3.5 billion selling computer chips that use these patents. That's not all the computer chips they sell. Those are only the ones that use BBN -- these BBN patents.

You're also going to learn that their profit margin on these particular profits is about double the profit margin on their product line as a whole, 57 percent. That means 57 cents out of every dollar they're putting into their pocket as profit. It's almost \$2 billion.

1.8 percent of that, it's a lot of money.

It's about \$37 million. Okay? That's what Dr. Vellturo opines is appropriate in this case.

So, where are we? You're going to learn, now, that is more money than those two other companies paid.

Now, it's the same percentage, remember. One of those companies paid 1.8 percent and the other paid

1.9 percent. So, Dr. Vellturo is using the lower of the two and the same percentage; but it's more money. And the reason it's more money, ladies and gentlemen, is illustrated right here on the board. If you add up the past revenue and the future revenue of those other two companies that use these patents, it comes up to about \$53 million.

Look at that in comparison to what Intel has

made by selling chips that use these BBN patents. That's the reason that even if you apply the same percentage, it's more money.

Now, I want to talk to you about what Intel is going to say because it's quite interesting. Intel's first line of defense is going to be "We don't use these patents. We just don't infringe them." That's what they say first and foremost.

They're going to call Dr. Harry Bims.

Dr. Bims is going to come in, and he's going to talk to you about these claims just like I have. And I expect the other side will show you something like this. And he's going to come in; and he's going to basically admit, ladies and gentlemen -- really not basically. He's going to admit that these first two claims are in fact -- elements, excuse me -- are, in fact, in the Intel products. Okay?

This is straight out of his report. It's an admission that these first two claim limitations or these two elements are present. They're not going to fuss about Number 4 either. So, all they're really going to do is they're going to fuss about Number 3. It's an element that requires a demultiplexer for receiving instructions.

Dr. Bims is going to have some very

hypertechnical excuses about this. Okay? He's basically on some level going to say that this computer, these processors, don't have instructions. That's what it's going to base down to. They want you to effectively believe that these computers, these computer chips know what to do without it being instructed to do so. That just doesn't make any sense. Computers can only do what we tell them to do; and the evidence is going to show you the software -- the code and the documents, that there are instructions that tell these chips which CRC circuit -- the first, second -- which one to use, whether to use one or both. That means there is infringement, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, Intel doesn't stop there. Okay? So, their first line of defense is with "We don't use it. There is no infringement." They want to hedge their bets a bit; and they said, "Well, if you decide that we use it, it's really okay because these patents are invalid. They're no good."

So, they want to hedge their bets, ladies and gentlemen; and they're going to call you two separate experts, Dr. Bims and a fellow from England named Dr. Gavin Stark. Okay? And they're going to testify about two separate pieces of prior art, two separate products. They don't talk about the same thing. I think

you're going to figure out why. They don't really agree on some fairly important things. But they're going to call these two different people. And what I want you to pay attention to, ladies and gentlemen, is that it's these four products only that they say are exactly the same as this patent claim. Only four. They do not rely on any patents, ladies and gentlemen, to say that this claim or any of our claims are anticipated, not a single patent, only these four products.

I want you to also listen carefully to their background, like I said, because sometimes things might not appear exactly as they are. So, they're going to call Dr. Stark, as I told you. Dr. Stark is going to testify about one of those products -- it's called "Hydrogen" -- and a related product called "Monsoon." Well, what you're going to learn is that Dr. Stark worked for a company called "Basis Communications" when he developed that. Intel purchased Basis, his former company, for hundreds of millions of dollars. And Dr. Stark personally made \$25 million off that transaction.

You're also going to hear that Dr. Stark stayed on at Intel and worked for Intel; and you're even going to find out that today as we are in Tyler, Texas, on the Monday morning of spring break, that the company

he works for now still has an important business relationship with Intel. What you're going to learn, ladies and gentlemen, and what I would suggest to you is you've got to take that into consideration when you listen to his testimony.

Now, what's important and I want to point out to you is this. Remember this chart that's in your binder that I've reproduced for you? You have to go through and you have to say, well, these four products that these expert witnesses are relying on, do they have all the same things as the BBN patents? Because if they don't, that means they don't invalidate by anticipation.

Well, his Honor gives us an extremely important definition. It's in these first two elements, a first CRC circuit and a second CRC circuit. What his Honor tells you and that we're all bound to apply is that those are "separate circuits that do not share an output register or a feedback path."

What that means, folks, of course, is if it shares an output path or a feedback register, even if it's got two polynomials, it is one circuit. If it is one circuit, if those four prior products only have one circuit, they do not invalidate this claim.

I don't think Intel is going to get up here and show this to you here in a couple of minutes because

it's devastating to their case.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is just a simple drawing that Dr. Stone made and what you'll see here on the left is Hydrogen, Dr. Stark's product. It's got one residue register, and then you see this line that goes out of the bottom where it says "residue register" and goes up to the top -- to the two yellow boxes. That's a feedback path. Shared feedback, one shared register. It is different than the BBN inventions that you have two separate circuits because they have -- each circuit has its own polynomial, its own register, and its own feedback.

Ladies and gentlemen, Intel will go even a little farther. They want to hedge their bets one more time. They say, "Well, okay. If we actually do use this patent and if it is valid, well, it's just not very good.

16 It's junk. We shouldn't have to pay much for it."

They're going to call their very own expert, Mary
Woodford, who is going to come in here and say that Intel

19 should have to only pay \$350,000.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is 0.01. That's one one-hundredth of a percent.

Despite the fact these other companies paid

1 percent and up to 2 percent, she says one one-hundredth
of a percent.

It makes no sense because one of those

companies, the one that paid the 1.18, made -- Intel has made 90 times more money than that company made in the past and expected to make in the future. It is unreasonable, ladies and gentlemen.

Ms. Woodford is also going to come in and say, "Well, if Intel had known about these patents, they could have adopted a non-infringing alternative." Her opinions are going to depend on that. And she says if they had known -- well, that's real important, ladies and gentlemen, because what you're going to hear is that in November of 2000 they were aware of these patents.

Here is a letter to the vice-president and the general counsel that draws these very two patents to issue. In fact, you're going to hear -- Intel looked at these patents and you're going to hear this deposition today that says, "Yeah, we got these patents back in 2007 and we looked at them, but we don't know what our conclusion was as to whether or not there was any infringement." Ladies and gentlemen, that doesn't make a lick of sense.

And, so, what do they do? They turn around and write us a letter and they say, "Thanks but no thanks. We looked at the patents but thanks but no thanks." And that's it.

At the end of the case, ladies and gentlemen,

I ask you to please conclude what I think and I suggest to you is appropriate, that Intel's server processors with rolling 16-bit CRC use these two United States patents, that the Patent Office -- that these patents are, in fact, valid and that Intel should pay its due. It should pay what other folks have done and that is 1.18 percent of all the money it's made, the billions, the three and a half billion dollars it's made by using this invention.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Campbell.

MR. CAMPBELL: Good afternoon, instead of "good morning." My name is Chad Campbell. It's a pleasure to be here speaking for Intel today. On behalf of the many men and women that make up that company, we thank you for your service. We appreciate the time and the attention that you're going to give, and we expect to do our very best to provide some education and hopefully some points of interest along the way.

I'm going to divide my remarks today into three topics that the evidence later in the week, when we get to present our case, will detail.

The first point is an introduction to Intel and its history of innovation. You heard a little bit during *voir dire* about Intel, but I'd like to introduce

you to a little bit more. Intel pioneered the microprocessor and over the course of time has been successful in developing that technology and bringing about changes in computing.

Now, the particular microprocessors that are at issue in this case were developed independently by Intel. Mr. Milliken, BBN, and these patents didn't have anything to do with that. We'll show you why.

The second point I'll cover today has to do with invalidity. I'd like to introduce you to some evidence that explains why even though the Patent Office issued these patents, they didn't have the full story. I'm going to introduce you to some network processor engineers who actually built products before Mr. Milliken started doing his work that had the same idea. And because you have to be first to have a valid patent, as his Honor instructed earlier and will instruct later, those prior art products render the patents invalid.

My third point today is going to talk about non-infringement. We'll discuss the reasons why there are differences between the patents that Stragent now owns and the technology that Intel is using on these particular products. The Stragent patents are about network processors, and network processors move data around the Internet. They are specialized to do that.

The rolling 16-bit CRC technology isn't for moving data around on the Internet. It's about something very specific and different, and those differences lead to the reasons for non-infringement.

So, let me begin. Intel changed the face of computing. In the 1970s computers used to be quite big. They would take up a whole room. Today the same processing technology is available in a laptop that we can hold in our hands and on our lap. A big reason for that improvement has to do with developments in microprocessor technology that Intel has led.

Intel pioneered the microprocessor in 1971; and through the course of time, by improving that technology, it has actually been recognized for its contributions to our country, our economy, and our well-being. In fact, three times our nation's president, Presidents Reagan and both of the President Bushes, awarded Intel the National Medal of Technology. The Patent Office has awarded Intel 20,000 patents over time for the same development and activity.

Now, it isn't a nameless and faceless company that's done that. Those improvements have come about from three things that the Intel scientists, engineers, and technicians have managed to accomplish. It takes drive, it takes creativity, and it takes teamwork.

The processors that were developed here that we're going to be talking about were developed by teams of more than a thousand people. They're very complicated. They have lots of different functions and features. The technology that we're talking about here today is really just a very small part of that.

These are the names of the processors that have been accused of infringement in this case. You'll hear different code names and product names throughout the course of the case and we'll try to make that clear but I wanted to highlight one of them and that's called the "Tukwila processor." That's the very first one that was manufactured.

And here's why I wanted to highlight that for you. You just heard Mr. Albritton mention a letter from BBN that was sent to Intel in 2007. That was the very first time that Intel ever heard anything at all about these patents, that November of 2007 letter. By then the Tukwila processors were already being manufactured. Now, what that means is before Intel ever heard about these patents, the technology that we're going to be talking about here was fully developed. The patents, BBN, and Mr. Milliken didn't have anything to do with it.

You'll hear from a gentleman named Debendra das Sharma and another gentleman named Bob Maddox who

will discuss with you the evolution and history of how Intel came about rolling 16-bit CRC technology. And it goes all of the way back to 2001.

Let's talk next about the Milliken patent claims and why they aren't valid. Now, it turns out that CRCs, cyclic redundancy check technology, is very old. It's more than 50 years old. I'm showing on the screen right now to the left a figure that has a cyclic redundancy check circuit that was included in a paper that was published back in 1961. That's before LBJ was sworn in as president. It's a long time ago.

In the intervening years there have been 500 patents that have been issued by the Patent Office on many different ways to do CRC technology. So, there's a lot of CRC technology that's out there; and just because there are CRCs that are being used by Intel in connection with these chips doesn't answer any of the questions. We have to look further. We've got to look beyond just the word "CRC."

On the right-hand side of this diagram is actually a figure from Mr. Milliken's patent. It's Figure Number 4. And it actually shows the exact same calculating circuit that was published all the way back in 1961.

Now, let me be specific about the prior art.

This is Dr. Gavin Stark you're seeing on the screen. I think you'll enjoy meeting him. He's come here a long ways, from Cambridge, England, where he lives with his family; and he's going to talk to us about -- mostly about two different chips. He has spent -- after being educated at Cambridge and getting his PhD, he spent the better part of 25 years designing network processors, the very same kind of processors that the patents are about.

I'm holding in my hand two of the chips that he designed. Now, these chips were real products that actually went into real things that got sold and used by folks. One of them is the Hydrogen, which is also known as the "PS-7900." The other one is the Monsoon. He's designed a lot of other network processors, but we'll focus on these two during the case.

There isn't any question that these are prior art. They were done before Mr. Milliken ever got started with his inventive work as he claims, and Dr. Stark is going to come here and explain to you why Mr. Milliken is actually attempting to claim the ideas that Dr. Stark worked on and developed in the products that were sold first. You have to be first to have a valid patent. Mr. Milliken wasn't the first, and that's the reason why these patents aren't valid.

We talked a little bit about network

processors. That's actually what Mr. Milliken titled his invention. The first document he sent to the Patent
Office was entitled "Multiprotocol Network Processor with Instructions Optimized for Packet Processing."

When he did his final application to the Patent Office, he again used the word "network processor" in the title. The text of the patent also talks about network processors. And we're going to find out that the figures and the way that the patents teach to use CRCs and the claim limitations, the way they work together, they all are directed towards a style of computing that network processors need to have.

So, let's look just a little bit further at this concept of network processing. The Internet is a collection of big -- a big collection of computers that speak different languages to each other. If you think about perhaps a translator that works at the United Nations, somebody who speaks many different languages, that kind of a person would be very useful there in listening to people who talk different languages in helping them to communicate to each other. That's really what a network processor does. Because on the Internet you've got lots of different kinds of computers and lots of different computer languages that are called "protocols," it's important to have a network processor

that can deal with one kind of a language coming from one direction and a different kind of a language coming from another direction.

So, that's what a network processor does.

They need to be able to talk different languages at different times.

Now, these computer languages, or protocols, actually define CRCs. They actually use different kinds of CRCs, and they have specific mathematical requirements that are written into their language protocols in much the same way that there are different rules for French than there are for languages like English and German. They all have their different rules about grammar and their different vocabulary. Well, in computer speak when we're talking about network protocols, they also have different rules about CRCs.

And, so, what Mr. Milliken did was he came up with an idea that said, "You know what? We're going to put into our network processor a couple of different specialized CRC circuits and we're going to use the polynomials in those circuits that are good for network processing and we're going to have different ones so that when one computer language is coming at the network processor, it can use the CRC specific for that one and then maybe send the message on along to a different

network using a different language and therefore a different CRC."

So, this idea of being able to hear through one ear, so to speak, you know, the message, translate it into a different language, use a different CRC, and send it out along was at the center of what Mr. Milliken was working on.

Now, I've done just a little bit of a color graphic here to kind of help us see what's going on; and this is the idea that he came up with and disclosed in his patent. First of all, you need a CRC instruction. That's going to tell the machine, tell the processor which of these CRC circuits ought to be used. And also it's going to tell the processor when to do the CRC.

So, we get an instruction; and in this particular case the instruction said, "I want to do a CRC-10 now" and it also said, "Do the 10 instead of one of the others." Those two jobs, when to do it and which one to use.

Maybe on the next iteration, there is going to be different information coming on a different protocol. And so the instruction issues; and this time when it's time to do a CRC, it says, "Do CRC-32." In a nutshell that's Mr. Milliken's idea. He actually described it in words in the patent in Column 4. I've highlighted here

where he's talking about that same figure we just looked at. You need to have instructions, and I want you to notice that he's talking about instructions that do two things. They indicate two separate things. We indicate first (reading) that a CRC operation is to be performed and also indicate which of the circuits 305 through 308 is to perform the operation.

And then the demultiplexer that receives that instruction "selects the appropriate one of the circuits." "Selects the appropriate one."

Now, in the Hydrogen, this chip that Dr. Stark designed and helped to build, there are actually CRC circuits inside of here; and he's going to come and explain to you why there are two separate ones using the court's construction and explain to you why there's both a CRC-32 and a CRC-10.

You might ask yourself "Now, how is he going to prove to us what's inside this chip," right? Even if we took the top off of it, we would just see a bunch of stuff in there that looks electrical and we wouldn't really be able to tell.

Well, Dr. Stark actually designed the chip by using a special computer code; and we still have that code. He's going to bring it here and show it to you and point you to the places where it shows that there are

separate CRC circuits -- there's both a CRC-32 and a CRC-10.

I've highlighted just a little bit of that code here on the screen. It's too big to show all of it to you, but we'll talk further about it in a little bit.

There's also a CRC-10, and that's also documented by code. We know what's inside the chip because of that code, and that code is going to be important for you to look at and listen to when Dr. Stark testifies.

There's also instructions that go with the Hydrogen. You'll notice here that there is an instruction that's going to tell us, "Hey, it's time to do a CRC" -- that's job Number 1 of the instruction -- and which of the circuits, which one of the circuits, CRC-32 or CRC-10.

And, so, just like Mr. Milliken was trying to teach in his patents, which was after Dr. Stark did his work, Dr. Stark's actual chip that got sold to the public which is prior art did the same thing. Dr. Stark did it first, before Mr. Milliken did.

He's also going to talk to you -- Dr. Stark is -- about another chip, this Monsoon chip. You'll notice these code names sometimes have an interesting ring to them. But the code name is actually what they

use when they are designing it; and then when it actually gets sold, it gets a product name. The product name is what's on the chip; but the Monsoon chip, or the IXP225, was one where Dr. Stark took his work from the Hydrogen -- that's called the "list manager." He put that in the chip; and then he added even more CRCs to it in something called an "AAL coprocessor," or an NPE, a network processing engine.

Again, another network processor just like the patents are talking about with instructions that do those two jobs, when am I going to do a CRC and which CRC am I going to do.

We'll get to the claims in the case. This is claim 12. It's one of the claims. I wanted to just highlight again that just like in the patent description and the figure, it's talking about those instructions. When we get to the prior art and we're thinking about, you know, did Dr. Stark's work do the same thing as Mr. Milliken later tried to claim, we're going to need to be focused on these limitations, too. And you'll notice that in the claim language itself that same idea that the patents talk about and teach is in there. You've got (reading) an instruction that indicates that a CRC operation is to be performed and it indicates which of the first and second circuits is to perform the CRC

operation thereby providing an indicated circuit.

If we have time, I'm going to introduce you to some additional folks who were network processor engineers that had the very same idea and built chips with it before Mr. Milliken, Matt Adiletta and Brad Burres worked for Intel. They worked up in Massachusetts; and they designed a network processor called the "Hyannis," or the "IXP1250," which also did the same stuff. It had multiple CRCs in it and instructions that would allow you to select between them and do the CRCs when it was time.

Now, here is an important piece of the patent that I think you ought to consider. We heard about, you know, the Patent Office and the work that they do.

They're fine folks, and I know that they do the best that they can. But no system is perfect, just like the patent video told you this morning. And it turns out that the Patent Office didn't know about Dr. Stark's work or about Matt Adiletta's work or Brad Burres' work on network processors. They didn't know, and they didn't get to talk to those folks before they had to make a decision about whether to allow the patents.

And Intel, my client, didn't get to participate in that process. It's interesting that you, the members of the jury, are the very first ones in this

whole process who are going to hear this information and make a decision about invalidity in light of these network processor prior arts. It's an important responsibility, and we thank you for undertaking it.

One other thing I'd like to mention is there was a reference to the fact that Dr. Stark actually did join Intel. This Monsoon chip, this Monsoon chip, when Intel found out about it, okay, and learned about the company Basis, it was impressed with the technology that Dr. Stark had come up with and did acquire the company that he worked for.

And what's interesting is you'll notice that Dr. Stark -- you know, his work was acquired in the 2000s, many, many, many years before BBN ever sent that letter and told Intel about these patents. So, there were lots of folks at Intel who knew about CRCs, including Dr. Stark and others. The BBN patents had nothing to do with Intel's work in the intervening years.

Let's talk about non-infringement. Now, we talked about network processors and how they are specialized in moving data around the Internet from one computer network perhaps all the way across the globe to another one. The technology that we're talking about now with rolling 16-bit CRC, it's not about that kind of, you know, vast open-ended different protocol communication.

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's also not about communications even inside a data center from one computer to another. And it's not about the server level.

What it is is actually the chip-to-chip level, and I actually brought something that I think might help to illustrate this. I'm holding in my hand here the inside of a server, and you'll see that there are four microprocessors that are mounted on the board. These are actually four Tukwila processors. And the communication that we're talking about for rolling 16-bit CRC, it's only communication that covers really -- it's measured in inches. It's between the chips. It's not communication that goes outside the computer to a different computer. And the communication pathways not only are in inches but it's all just one protocol. And, so, we see right off the bat, you know, the problem that the chips have in talking to each other is very different from the problem that Mr. Milliken was working on where he needed to have multiple protocols and many different things going on and choosing from one to the other.

Those differences actually matter when it comes to trying to understand what the non-infringement issues are about in this case.

Let me introduce you a little bit more to

Dr. Debendra das Sharma. He's the one who back in 2001

proposed the idea of rolling 16-bit CRC. Now, rolling 16-bit CRC got its name literally because it's kind of a rolling algorithm. Once you get going with it, you really can't interrupt it and do something else and come back to it. If you're going to roll, you've got to roll. So, that's the basic idea.

I want to introduce you to why. Why did rolling 16-bit CRC come into being? What happened was Intel was first considering doing this QPI, or QuickPath Interconnect, link that we've been talking a little bit about way back in, you know, the early 2000-2001 time period.

Dr. das Sharma, who works at Intel today, worked at Hewlett-Packard back then; and the two companies were collaborating. And Dr. das Sharma wondered whether what Intel was proposing to do with CRCs on the link might benefit from having more protection. So, one of the things that is additional and it's even mentioned in the patents here is that in order to get more protection, you make your CRC calculation longer.

You might think of that like a password to your account, you know, on *Google Mail* or something like that. If you make it longer, you're going to get a little more protection. Well, the principle is kind of the same with CRCs. You want to get more protection; you

make it longer.

So, he suggested to Intel that hey, maybe we ought to be making the CRC longer on this link. And Intel said we really don't want to do that because we're microprocessor people and what we need to do is to make products smaller not bigger. And, so, having a longer CRC would have required more pins and made the chip bigger; and that wasn't a good idea.

So, when Dr. das Sharma heard that, he went back and started thinking, "Well, how could I make the CRC stronger without making it longer?" And he thought a lot about that and came up with a very ingenious idea which isn't mentioned anywhere in the Milliken patents and which is very different from Mr. Milliken's approach.

This is what he came up with. This is the rolling algorithm. You won't see anything like that in the patents. What it requires is the combination of two different packets, two different packets running through two different CRCs and then combining those things together.

Now, we went over how Mr. Milliken's patents talk about picking one or the other, being able to switch back and forth between one or the other. That's not what rolling CRC is about.

Now, because of the technique that

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

130

Dr. das Sharma came up with, whereas in the Milliken patents if you wanted to have a 16-bit CRC value instead of an 8-bit value you would need a longer CRC,

Dr. Debendra das Sharma's idea was, "Hey, we can come up with this rolling algorithm and we can make each of those 8 bits stronger instead of making the thing longer."

So, here's a couple of slides that I'm going to show you that kind of describe the differences between 8-bit and the rolling 16-bit that kind of lead to the discussion of non-infringement.

Most of the computers that use the accused chips actually don't even use the rolling 16-bit CRC. For a long time Intel wasn't aware of anybody using such Today we know that Hewlett-Packard is using them on some of the servers that they make but not all. But folks like IBM that use Intel's chips and others, they don't use the rolling 16-bit algorithm at all. Why? Because they don't need to. 8-bit is good enough. when you're doing 8-bit, what happens is each and every Flit that comes out, the hardware just automatically, without waiting for any kind of an instruction, slaps an 8-bit CRC on it using a circuit called a "generator A." So, every time you're doing a packet -- and they call them "Flits" for flow control unit. Every time you're doing one of those Flits, Generator A gets used.

This is what the CRC rolling algorithm that Dr. Debendra das Sharma came up with looks like and how it works. You're running one packet or Flit through Generator A, and you're running a second packet or Flit through Generator B. You've got two different generators there going with two different Flits but then you're going to combine them together and it's the combination that you're going to use as the check sum.

Now, that idea isn't part of what Mr. Milliken came up with and talked about in his patents; and it's different from the claims. And let me just illustrate why. If we look at the claim again, claim 12, we've got that demultiplexer limitation again and the instruction needs to do two things, instruction that has to do two things.

First, the instruction needs to indicate that a CRC operation is to be performed. Now, when you set up your QPI link, it just runs and rolls. If you're using rolling or if you're using 8-bit, it just goes. Every time there is a Flit, you've got to have a CRC. In fact, in the definition of the Flit itself, it has to have a CRC. So, it doesn't wait for an instruction to do that. The hardware is set up to do it on its own.

There are instructions in these chips, but they don't manage this process. The instructions are for

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other kinds of things where you need to know when to do something and when not to do them. With the QPI link, there is no question. If we're going to send a Flit, you've got to have a CRC. That's just part of the definition; and, so, the hardware is set up to work automatically without waiting for an instruction to tell it to do one. And, so, because we don't have that kind of an instruction, one that's going to say, okay, it's time, do a CRC, there isn't infringement for that reason.

There is not infringement also for a second If you notice here our instruction is supposed to do a second job. It's supposed to indicate "which of the first and second circuits is" -- it's not "are"; it doesn't say "both" -- "which of the first and second circuits is to perform the CRC operation thereby providing an indicated circuit." Ladies and gentlemen, two is not one. And, so, the claim doesn't talk about rolling 16-bit CRC. Technology developed for chips that talk to each other over a single protocol this way, but what the claim is talking about is that idea of having networks with different protocols and the need and the ability to switch on the fly. If I'm going to talk one language, I need one CRC. If I'm going to start talking another language, I need an instruction to tell me to switch over between one or the other. It's not a claim

about both.

And we'll be introducing further details about that to you, and my time is just about spent. I've enjoyed speaking to you. I haven't said anything about damages, and there is a reason for that. If these patents are invalid, as Intel contends that they are, or if they are not infringed as Intel contends that they are, no damages are appropriate.

Now, we will be presenting evidence on damages because the court has kindly indicated that we need to present whatever we're going to present on all issues.

But it isn't because we don't have confidence in those liability defenses.

The final thing I'll mention to you is that most of the server products that Intel sells, the vast majority of them that have QPI, QuickPath Interconnect, don't even have the 16-bit option on them. So, the idea that rolling 16-bit is somehow important, okay, you're going to hear evidence that's going to suggest that it's not. It just hasn't been accepted in the marketplace. So, the allegations that they are making about a lot of value being derived by Intel, the evidence is going to contradict.

The other thing that you're going to learn is that the two licenses that Stragent received to the

other -- from those other companies were for sums that were very small compared to the amount that they are asking today. They were for \$100,000 and for \$350,000; and you're going to hear testimony that is going to explain that those people settled those lawsuits because they wanted to avoid the cost of the litigation. It wasn't because they thought that there was value there. And you're going to be invited to use those comparisons to decide what to do there.

Thank you for your time and your attention, and we look forward to your deliberations and your verdict. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Okay. I thank both counsel. Now it is time for our lunch break. We'll return at 20 minutes to 2:00.

Remember, members of the jury, not to discuss the case with anyone else and even among yourselves until you get to the final deliberations.

Now, lunch has been provided. The parties have gotten together and agreed to provide lunch to the jury; so, you have lunch in the jury room. You can go out of the courthouse and stretch your legs if you want, but you don't need to go out for lunch.

So, we'll adjourn now until 20 minutes of 2:00.

```
135
               (Recess, 12:41 p.m. to 1:40 p.m.)
 1
2
               (Open court, all parties present, jury
3
   present.)
4
              THE COURT: Now is the time for the receipt of
   the evidence and the plaintiff will go first.
6
   Mr. Albritton.
7
              MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you very much, your
8
   Honor.
9
              Plaintiff calls Stephen Milligan.
10
               (The oath is administered.)
11
              THE COURT:
                           Mr. Albritton, you may begin.
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                               Thank you, your Honor.
12
13
   moment.
14
              Your Honor, may I approach the witness and the
15
   court.
              THE COURT: Yes.
16
17
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                               May it please the court.
18
              THE COURT: You may proceed.
19
             <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION OF STEPHEN MILLIGAN</u>
20
               <u>CALLED ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF</u>
   BY MR. ALBRITTON:
21
22
          Dr. Milligan, would you please introduce yourself
23
   to the jury?
24
          Good afternoon. I'm Stephen Milligan.
   Α.
25
          Dr. Milligan, how old a man are you?
   Q.
```

- A. I'm 66 years old.
- 2 Q. Do you have a family?
- 3 A. Yes, I do. My wife Carol and I have been married
- 4 for 42 years, and we have three adult children.
- 5 Q. Where do you and Carol live, Dr. Milligan?
- 6 A. We live in a rural town about 30 miles west of
- 7 Boston which is called "Stow," Massachusetts.
- 8 Q. Dr. Milligan, where did you go to undergraduate
- 9 school?
- 10 A. I was the very first in my family to go to
- 11| college; and I went to MIT, the Massachusetts Institute
- 12 of Technology.
- 13 Q. And what degree did you receive from MIT?
- 14 A. At MIT I got a degree in aeronautical and
- 15 astronautical engineering.
- 16 Q. While you were at MIT in undergraduate school, did
- 17| you have the opportunity to work on any exciting
- 18 projects?
- 19 A. Yes, I did. I had the great fortune to be able to
- 20 work on the Apollo project. I worked on the guidance and
- 21 control for both the command module and the lunar
- 22 excursion module.
- 23 Q. After you finished your undergraduate work at MIT,
- 24 did you go on and get a PhD?
- 25 A. Yes, I did. I went to the University of Rhode

- 1 Island and got a master's and a doctorate in ocean
- 2 engineering.
- 3 Q. Dr. Milligan, where are you currently employed?
- 4 A. I'm currently employed at BBN Technologies.
- 5 Q. And what company owns BBN?
- 6 A. BBN is owned by Raytheon Corporation.
- 7 Q. What is Raytheon?
- 8 A. Raytheon is a large defense contractor. They make
- 9 patriot missiles and big radars and things like that.
- 10 Q. Tell us a little bit about BBN. When was it
- 11 founded and by whom?
- 12 A. BBN was founded in 1948 by two MIT professors and
- 13 one of their graduate students, and they founded the
- 14 company to do the design work on the General Assembly
- 15 Hall of the UN.
- 16 Q. Now, you said BBN is currently owned by Raytheon.
- 17 How much did Raytheon pay to purchase BBN?
- 18 A. They paid \$350 million.
- 19 Q. Prior to BBN being owned by Raytheon, tell us a
- 20 little bit about the ownership history of BBN.
- 21 A. Well, just before Raytheon purchased us, we were
- 22 held by a group of venture capitalist firms and some of
- 23 the -- and the employees. Before that, there was -- it
- 24 was Verizon, a large telephone company. Before that,
- 25 GTE. Before that, we were a publicly traded company on

- the New York Stock Exchange.
- 2 Q. Where is BBN located, Dr. Milligan?
- 3 A. Our main office is in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 4 Q. Are there other offices of BBN?
- 5 A. There are seven other offices, yes.
- 6 Q. How many people today work for BBN?
- 7 A. There are 750 people.
- 8 Q. And how long have you been at BBN?
- 9 A. I've been there since 1978. It's coming up on 36
- 10 years.
- 11 Q. Dr. Milligan, what is your current title at BBN?
- 12 A. I am the chief technologist, the chief technical
- 13 officer of the company.
- 14 Q. And how long have you been the chief technical
- 15 officer?
- 16 A. I was appointed the chief technical officer in
- 17 1999.
- 18 Q. As the chief technical officer, are you ultimately
- 19 responsible for all of BBN's technical projects?
- 20 A. Yes, I have the ultimate technical responsibility
- 21 for our performance of those projects, yes.
- 22 Q. Are you a named inventor on any United States
- 23 patents?
- 24 A. I have 12 issued U.S. patents.
- 25 Q. Just on a very high level, what's the subject

matter of some of those patents?

- Well, they are fairly varied. The most recent ones are on radar and communications. There is one on spam processing, several on optimal scheduling and optimal planning; and the vast majority are on the detection of -- detection and tracking of sniper bullets.
- What are your responsibilities as the chief Q. technical officer at BBN?
- They are largely split three different ways. first and foremost is my technical responsibilities 11 overseeing the execution of all of our projects;
- secondly, I'm the sort of voice of the technologists and 12 13

the other scientists with the rest of the executives; and

- lastly, I meet with the senior technical levels of our 14
- 15 clients.

2

- Tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury a little 16 Q. bit about what BBN does. 17
- Well, BBN is a contract research and development 18 19 That means we bid on and win competitive company.
- 20 contracts to build the first of something typically,
- 21 typically for the U.S. Government actually.
- 22 Well, let's talk about that. Who are the -- what
- kind of customers or clients, if you will, does BBN have?
- 24 Α. Essentially all of our customers are in the
- 25 science and technology part of the government.

- l largest single client is DARPA.
- 2 Q. Let me interrupt you there. What is DARPA?
- 3 A. DARPA stands for the Defense Advanced Research
- 4 Projects Agency.
- 5 Q. Okay. What other governmental agencies does BBN
- 6 do work for?
- 7 A. So, the other agencies again are in science and
- 8 technology. So, there would be AFRL, Air Force Research
- 9 Laboratory; Army Research Laboratory; Office of Naval
- 10 Research; and the National Science Foundation.
- 11 Q. Does BBN also do work for private industry?
- 12 A. Yes, we do.
- 13 Q. About what percentage of BBN's work is
- 14 governmental work and what percentage of BBN's work is
- 15 for private industry?
- 16 A. Well, it varies year to year; but many years it's
- 17 about 90 percent government work.
- 18 Q. How does BBN normally charge for and get paid for
- 19 its work?
- 20 A. Essentially all of our contracts are -- we're paid
- 21| by the hour. We basically charge an hour when we work
- 22 for a client.
- 23 Q. Dr. Milligan, does BBN have experience in Internet
- 24 technologies?
- 25 A. Yes. I think you could say we do have a lot of

experience in that.

1

17

Α.

- Q. Does that include designing routers and related graphs are sequipment for use with routers?
- 4 A. Yes. BBN won the very first contract from DARPA
 5 to build the very first device which ultimately would be
 6 called a "router." It was called an "interface message
 7 processor" at the time. And we had the contract to put
 8 up the first four nodes of the Internet.
- 9 Q. What was the Internet originally called?
- 10 A. It was called the "ARPANET" then.
- 11 Q. Now, have there been any books written about BBN's 12 work with respect to the development of the Internet?
- 13 A. Yes. There was a book written. I believe it was
 14 called "Where Wizards Work [sic] Late."
- 15 Q. Has BBN also been involved in other Internet 16 technologies?
- on it more or less continuously since then. A fellow
 that still works for us, Ray Tomlinson, sent the very
 first e-mail. He's the one that picked the "@" sign to
 put in your e-mail address. Early on we built the
 defense data network which was the network for the entire

After our founding of the Internet, we've worked

defense data network which was the network for the entire
defense department, their network. And subsequently
we've worked a lot for DARPA building various advances in

25 the network as the network has grown and improved.

- Q. And all of that work involves the design of2 hardware, for instance?
- 3 A. Typically the specification of the hardware, yes, 4 though we don't actually do detailed design of hardware
- 5 ourselves.
- Q. Okay. Now I want to talk to you about some work7 at BBN in the late Nineties and the early Two Thousands.
- 8 Can you give us an example of a few projects that were 9 significant at BBN?
- 10 A. Well, one of the significant ones was the DARPA
 11 gigabit router. DARPA was interested in essentially
- 12 proving to the world that it was possible to build a
- 13 router that was substantially faster than anything that
- 14 existed at that time, and BBN wanted competitive
- 15 procurement to build this gigabit router.
- 16 Q. How many gigabytes was it intended to --
- 17 A. It was intended to be 10 gigabits, which DARPA
- 18 generally tries to do something that is ten times the
- 19 speed of the art, at that point in time.
- 20 Q. Let's talk about BBN's work for private industry
- 21 and also in some Internet technologies. Has it also done
- 22 that as well?
- 23 A. Yes, we have.
- 24 Q. And why don't you tell us about some of the
- 25 projects that you've been personally involved in at BBN.

- A. Well, the one that I'm sort of the most proud of
- 2 is -- it was a DARPA request. The director of DARPA
- 3 called us and asked us to work on a problem for our
- 4 troops. They were being shot at and we previously had
- 5 experience in detecting sniper bullets and we were asked
- 6 to build a system that would detect and localize snipers
- 7 and alert our troops in their vehicles.
- 8 Q. What is that system called?
- 9 A. It's called "Boomerang."
- 10 Q. And where has it been deployed?
- 11 A. There's nearing 10,000 of them deployed in Iraq
- 12 and Afghanistan.
- 13 Q. Has BBN received any awards for its technological
- 14 achievements?

- 15 A. Yes. The first significant one was in 1991 when
- 16 the IEEE awarded us the Corporate Innovation Award for
- 17 our work on the Internet.
- 18 Q. What is the IEEE?
- 19 A. The IEEE is the international electronics and
- 20 electrical engineering society.
- 21 Q. And is there a more recent award?
- 22 A. Yes. Last year, in February, we had the great
- 23 honor to be awarded this country's highest technical
- 24 award. That's the National Medal of Technology and
- 25 Innovation.

- 1 Q. Did you personally receive that award?
- 2 A. Well, I got to go to --
- $\mathsf{S} \mid \mathsf{Q}.$ I mean not receive the award. Were you there when
- 4 it was awarded?
- 5 A. I would never take credit for the work of the
- 6 other people that worked on it. I did get to go to the
- 7 White House, along with our president, to accept the
- 8 award on behalf of the other people.
- 9 Q. I would like to visit with you about Walter
- 10 Milliken. Who is Walter Milliken?
- 11 A. Walter Milliken was a BBN employee. He started
- 12 work in 1978, as did I.
- 13 Q. Does he still work at BBN?
- 14 A. No. He retired in -- about three years ago -- I
- 15 think it was 2010 -- to help attend to his aging mother.
- 16 Q. He lives there in the northeast with his --
- 17 A. He lives up in New Hampshire.
- 18 Q. I'd like to visit with you about -- was
- 19 Mr. Milliken at BBN continuously, or was there any time
- 20 that he took away from BBN?
- 21 A. In the late Nineties there was the sort of
- 22 Internet boom or the dot-com boom, and he -- there was a
- 23 number of spinouts that happened where people left BBN.
- 24| And, so, in 1999 he left BBN and went to a start-up
- 25 router company. He was the CTO of that router company.

- Q. And about how long was he at that start-up
- 2 company?

- 3 A. It was about a year.
- 4 Q. So, you said he was the CTO. The chief technical
- 5 officer?
- 6 A. Yes, he was the CTO of that company.
- $7\mid \mathsf{Q}.$ At the time that Mr. Milliken retired from BBN,
- 8 what was his title?
- 9 A. Walter was a principal scientist.
- 10 Q. Now, if you would, Dr. Milligan, tell us about the
- 11 various levels within BBN and how one graduates from one
- 12 level to the next.
- 13 A. Like most companies, we have a sequence of
- 14 promotions that you can win going up through the ranks.
- 15 The last two of those are different in the sense -- like
- 16 many companies that are scientifically oriented, these
- 17 actually require the validation of your contribution to
- 18 the community by outside people. So, IT actually
- 19 requires letters of recommendation from the outside that
- 20 you are actually well recognized in your field. Many
- 21 other companies besides BBN refer to this as a "fellow."
- 22 Q. Did Mr. Milliken -- did he have the highest
- 23 position at the time he retired?
- 24 A. At the time he retired, he was a principal fellow,
- 25 yes.

- 1 Q. If you would, describe for the members of the 2 jury, Dr. Milligan, how Walter Milliken was sort of 3 viewed technologically within the company.
- 4 A. He was highly sought after. He was one of our 5 leading architects and --
- 6 Q. What is an architect?
- 7 A. Well, the architect is somebody who has sort of
 8 the overall vision of how something should go together,
 9 basically understands the project and all of its pieces
 10 and understands the best way to allocate the
- 11 functionality between different pieces of software,
- 12 different pieces of hardware, what should go in hardware,
- 13 what should go in software, and basically drive the
- 14 project to a successful conclusion.
- 15 Q. I want to talk to you about Mr. Milliken, some of
- 16 his more significant projects around the late Nineties
- 17 and the early Two Thousands. Would you tell the ladies
- 18 and gentlemen of the jury about a few of those?
- 19 A. Yes. He worked on a NASA project called the
- 20 "terminal access control." He worked for -- on the DARPA
- 21 multigigabit router; and he was, in fact, the tech lead
- 22 on that just prior to 2000.
- 23 Q. I want to take you back to that time frame, 2000,
- 24 the summer of 2000. Were you the chief technical officer
- 25 of the company at the time?

- A. Yes, sir, I was.
- Q. Are you familiar with a project called either the like the like
- 4 A. Yes, I am.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. If you would, tell the members of the jury on a high level about that project, please, sir.
 - A. We'd been approached by a company called "Irvine Sensors." Irvine Sensors made chips or designed chips and they had designed one which was going to be a very high-speed switch but it was just a single chip and they thought that it should be possible to turn that chip into a router because it was so fast. And at the time we were essentially the only independent company in the world where you could come to -- that didn't otherwise make routers as a living. You could come to us and say, "Could your scientists help us turn this chip into a router?"
 - So, they came to us and, through a sequence of consulting agreements and contracts, asked us to help them turn that chip into a router.
- 21 Q. When did that project start, Dr. Milligan?
- A. They first contacted us in late '99. I think the first actual contract was in 2000.
- Q. You mentioned the company was Irvine Sensors. Is that a private company or governmental agency?

- A. It's a private company.
- 2 Q. I've handed you a notebook, Dr. Milligan. I've
- ${f 3}$ handed one to Intel's lawyers and to the court. And I
- 4 would like you, if you would, please, sir, to turn to the
- 5 first tab. That's Plaintiff's Exhibit 171.
- 6 All right. The members of the jury can see it
- 7 as well.

- 8 Would you tell us what this document is,
- 9| Dr. Milligan?
- 10 A. Yes. This is a contract for us to perform a time
- 11 and materials contract to begin the design of the
- 12 so-called "Super Router."
- 13 Q. And what was the date of this agreement?
- 14 A. Effective 19 May 2000.
- 15 Q. Is that right around the time -- did the project
- 16 start right after this?
- 17 A. It would have started the next day.
- 18| Q. Now I'd like to turn your attention to Plaintiff's
- 19 Exhibit 172.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Do you recognize this document, Dr. Milligan?
- 22 A. Yes. This is a subsequent document where the work
- 23 had been expanded to do a larger project for the actual
- 24 router architecture and development.
- 25 Q. And what's the date of this document?

- A. It is dated 28 August.
- 2 Q. Dr. Milligan, were you personally -- I'm sorry.
- 3 Excuse me.

- 4 Was Walter Milliken involved in this iRouter
- 5 project?
- 6 A. Yes, he was. He was the lead architect.
- 7 Q. Were there any inventions or patents that came out
- 8 of this project?
- 9 A. Yes, there were.
- 10 Q. If you would, look in your binder at Plaintiff's
- 11 Exhibit 1, please, sir.
- 12 What do you see there in front of you,
- 13 Dr. Milligan?
- 14 A. I see a patent referred to as '072. It's a
- 15 "Network Processor Having Cyclic Redundancy Check
- 16 Implemented in Hardware."
- 17 Q. If you would, flip to the back near the end to the
- 18 claims. It would be in Column Number 6.
- 19 A. Column 6.
- 20 Q. Do you understand on a high level that that is one
- 21 of the claims at issue in this case?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And then if you would, go to the next page at
- 24 Column Number 7 which is claim 16.
- 25 A. Yes, I see that.

- 1 Q. And do both of those claims claim a, quote,
- 2 device?
- 3 A. It says "the device of claim 12," yes.
- 4 Q. Was the device of claim 12 and the device of
- 5 claim 16 invented by Walter Milliken during his work on
- 6 this iRouter project?
- 7 A. Yes, sir, it was.
- 8 Q. I'd like you to now look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 2.
- 9|What is that, Dr. Milligan?
- 10 A. This is the '244 patent.
- 11 \mid Q. \mid Is it also a patent that came out of the iRouter
- 12 project that lists Walter Milliken as an inventor?
- 13 A. Yes, it is.
- 14 Q. Are these the two patents that are at issue in
- 15 this case?
- 16 A. Yes, it is.
- 17 Q. If you would, please look at Plaintiff's
- 18| Exhibit 3. What is Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 3?
- 19 A. It is patent '102.
- 20 Q. Okay. And, now, is that also a patent that came
- 21 out of this iRouter project?
- 22 A. Yes. it is.
- 23 Q. Now, these three patents -- the '072 patent, the
- 24 '244 patent -- which are involved in this case -- and
- 25 this '102 patent -- are those all within the same patent

family?

2

- A. Yes. They would be called that, yes.
- 3 Q. So, they are related?
- $\mathsf{4}|\mathsf{\ A}.$ They are closely related, yes.
- 5 Q. Thank you very much.
- Were there other inventions that came out of the iRouter project other than these three patents we've liust talked about?
- 9 A. Yes. There were three other patents that came out 10 of it.
- 11 Q. If you would, tell the ladies and gentlemen of the 12 jury, on a high level, what those three other groups of
- 13 patents that came out of this same project relate to.
- 14 A. There was one that was called a "ternary CAM" for

use in a network processor -- that would be a three-way

- ·
- 17 control between multiple processors -- multiple network
- 18 processors -- multiprotocol flow between processors; and,

content addresser of memory -- there was one for flow

- 19 lastly, an execution unit for a network control
- 20 processor.

15

- 21 Q. Dr. Milligan, was Walter Milliken one of the named
- 22 inventors on all of those patents?
- 23 A. Yes, he was.
- 24 Q. Was there a project that was ultimately built and
- 25 commercialized as a result of this iRouter project?

- A. No, there wasn't actually.
- 2 Q. If you would, explain to the members of the jury
- 3 | why.
- 4 A. Well, Irvine Sensors ran out of money and wouldn't
- 5 pay us anymore.
- 6 Q. So, BBN doesn't work for free?
- 7| A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. I'd like to turn back your attention to
- 9 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. You
- 10 don't need to look at them in particular; but that's the
- 11 '072 patent and the '244 patent, the patents that are at
- 12 issue in this case.
- 0n a high level as a factual matter, what do
- 14 these patents relate to?
- 15 A. Well, the key aspect of these patents is to have
- 16 multiple hardware independent CRCs for error detection in
- 17 packet processing.
- 18 Q. Two separate circuits each with their own
- 19 hardwired polynomial?
- 20 MR. BURMAN: Objection, improper opinion
- 21 testimony, lack of foundation.
- 22 THE COURT: Could you repeat the guestion?
- 23 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 24 Q. These patents are about two CRC circuits with
- 25 their own hardwired polynomials?

- A. Yes, sir.
- 2 MR. BURMAN: Objection, leading. Sorry, your
- 3 Honor.

- 4 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 5 MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 6 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 7 Q. As the chief technologist of the company, do you
- 8 have an understanding about the advantages of these
- 9 patents?
- 10 MR. BURMAN: Same objection, your Honor.
- 11 Improper opinion testimony and lack of foundation.
- 12 MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, they asked him
- 13 these questions specifically at his deposition.
- 14 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 15 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 16 Q. So, if you would, Dr. Milligan, tell the ladies
- 17| and gentlemen what the advantages of -- the advantages of
- 18 the inventions in the '072 patent and the '244 patent
- 19 we're here about today.
- 20 A. The advantages would be that it's fast because
- 21 it's in hardware and flexible because it has multiple
- 22 circuits for processing different CRCs.
- 23 Q. What company, Dr. Milligan, currently owns
- 24 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, 2, and 3?
- 25 A. Stragent.

- 1 Q. Does BBN have a financial stake in the outcome of
- 2 this litigation?
- 3 A. Yes, we do.
- 4 Q. If you would, explain that to the jury.
- 5 A. Yes. We sold these patents for a license fee for
- 6 15 percent of the ongoing revenue stream that might be
- 7 generated from licensing them.
- 8 Q. So, if this jury awards money for Intel's
- 9 infringement, does BBN receive part of the proceeds?
- 10 A. We would receive 15 percent, yes.
- 11 Q. Is BBN proud of these inventions, Dr. Milligan?
- 12 A. Yes, we are.
- 13 Q. Are you proud of the work that Walter Milliken
- 14 did?

- 15 A. This work and all the rest of the work he did,
- 16 yes, sir.
- 17 MR. ALBRITTON: Pass the witness, your Honor.
- 18 MR. BURMAN: Your Honor, if she could approach
- 19 the witness with our notebooks.
- 20 THE COURT: Yes, but please identify yourself
- 21 for the record.
- 22 MR. BURMAN: Yes. My name is David Burman,
- 23 one of the counsel for Intel.
- 24 THE COURT: You may proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF STEPHEN MILLIKEN

2 BY MR. BURMAN:

- 3 Q. Dr. Milligan, my name again is David Burman. I'm
- 4 one of the attorneys for Intel in this matter.
- As you told us in your deposition, you had no
- 6 direct involvement with the Irvine Sensors project; isn't
- 7 that correct?
- 8 A. That is correct, sir. Yes.
- 9 Q. And you didn't know anything about
- 10 Mr. Milliken's -- Dr. Milliken's work on CRCs in that
- 11 project?
- 12 A. Not about CRCs, no, sir.
- 13 Q. Okay. And you know that no one else was listed by
- 14 BBN as an inventor even though the law would have
- 15 required you if someone else had materially participated
- 16 from BBN?
- 17 A. That is true, sir.
- 18 Q. And you also know that Walter Milliken -- and I
- 19 apologize if I get the "Milligan" and "Milliken"
- 20 confused.
- 21 A. He and I have done that for 36 years so...
- 22 Q. Yes. He's worked as a consultant for you and for
- 23 Stragent from time to time since his retirement, has he
- 24 not?
- 25 A. A few hours, yes.

- 1 Q. And he worked on this case for a time, correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Now, the possible Irvine Sensors project that you
- 4 said never got finished, it wasn't built on a platform of
- 5 BBN products, was it?
- 6 A. No, sir.
- 7 Q. And it didn't evolve from any BBN products?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. And the project was never finished?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Technology was never used?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. The patents were never used by BBN or anyone else
- 14 that it worked for to make products?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 Q. It's Mr. Milliken's invention, correct?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. And you agree that the question is whether he
- 19 really did something meaningful and not whether BBN is a
- 20 great company, correct?
- 21 A. But it's the inventor, yes.
- 22 Q. And I think you said in your deposition nothing
- 23 about BBN is relevant other than Mr. Milliken and what he
- 24 did, correct?
- 25 A. Sir, I would say that our previous work and

- Walter's previous work on a large number of routing and
- 2 Internet packet processing things is highly relevant.
- 3 Q. Correct. And BBN and the people that you tried to
- 4 sell these patents to repeatedly identified the patents
- 5 as involving network processors; isn't that correct?
- 6 A. In the -- they have repeatedly -- I don't know
- 7 about repeated. They identify them in the processing of
- 8 packets, yes.
- 9 Q. And you mentioned that BBN had sold these patents
- 10 to Stragent for 15 percent interest and a small up-front
- 11 amount, correct?
- 12 A. That is true.
- 13 Q. And that was part of an effort to monetize
- 14 hundreds of BBN patents?
- 15 A. They were part of the original offering of that,
- 16 yes.
- 17 Q. Okay. And you were part of approving that
- 18 offering in 2007; isn't that correct?
- 19 A. That is correct.
- 20 Q. And you sent a request for proposals to a bunch of
- 21 technology companies and not just Intel, for a hundred or
- 22 more patents.
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. Okay. And you reviewed that request that went out
- 25 to all of those companies?

- 1 A. No, sir, I did not review the actual letter that
- 2 went out.
- 3 Q. Okay. But you did review the selection of the
- 4 patents, correct?
- 5 A. I did review the selection of the patents offered.
- 6 Q. And you divided the patents into categories so
- 7 that the companies who received it could know if they
- 8 were relevant, correct?
- 9 A. They did have labels, yes.
- 10 Q. And the categories these all went under were
- 11 network processors or networking?
- 12 A. I believe the title was "networking."
- 13 Q. And that's, in fact, what you said to Intel when
- 14 you communicated to Intel after that package was put
- 15 together for all of those companies.
- 16 A. I don't know what was said actually.
- 17 Q. Oh, because you didn't review the letter. Okay.
- Now, you never suggested to Intel or to any of
- 19 the companies that you're aware of that these patents
- 20 related to server processors or to the links inside a
- 21 computer chip or between chips on a single board,
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. No.
- 24 Q. Now, it's true that Walter Milliken told you --
- 25 Mr. Milliken or Dr. Milliken. I apologize -- that he

- 1 thought Intel's network processors might infringe; isn't
- 2 that right?
- B A. He did bring that to our attention, yes.
- 4 Q. And he had studied Intel's network processors and
- 5 their evolution over the years leading up to 2001-2002;
- 6 isn't that right?
- 7 A. I cannot state whether he studied them or not.
- 8 Q. You're aware, aren't you, that he used an Intel
- 9 network processor as part of the development platform for
- 10 his work for Irvine Sensors?
- 11 A. I didn't believe he had used it for Irvine
- 12 Sensors.
- 13 Q. Well, he suggested to Irvine Sensors that this
- 14 patent should be applied for because Intel network
- 15 processors might infringe; isn't that correct?
- 16 A. I don't know that one way or the other, sir.
- 17 Q. And isn't it true that the patent was written as
- 18 much as possible to cover network processors and, in
- 19 particular, to copy Intel network processors?
- 20 A. I actually interpret it differently, sir. If you
- 21 think of packet processing, then --
- 22 Q. I'm sorry. I apologize. Could you answer my
- 23 question first?
- 24 A. Could you please restate it, then?
- 25 Q. Isn't it true that the intention of Walter

- $\mathsf{Milliken}$ and Mr. Houh was to write the patent in a way
- 2 that would cover Intel network processors?
- 3 A. I have no information about that, sir.
- 4 Q. Now, you never told Intel about your suspicion of 5 internetwork processors; isn't that correct?
- 6 A. Not to my knowledge.
- 7 Q. Because you were afraid that if you did, they
- 8 would investigate it; and if they disagreed they would go
- 9 to court to have the issue resolved properly; isn't that
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. No, sir.
- 12 Q. Why didn't you tell them that you thought --
- 13 A. We had no reason to believe one way or the other
- 14 that they were utilizing it. That would have required
- 15 knowledge that was not public knowledge to us one way or
- 16 the other.
- 17 Q. In terms of their use in network processors.
- 18 A. I asked -- we -- I didn't do it. We asked Walter
- 19 to look at the available public information and tell us;
- 20 and he said, "I've looked at it. I can't tell without
- 21 finding out more from what's inside it."
- 22 Q. Isn't it true that there are probably ten
- 23 documents in this case where he says, "I think Intel
- 24 network processors infringe"?
- 25 A. I think the important word is "I think."

- Q. But that's a little different than what you just
- 2 said, isn't it?
- 3 A. We asked him. He said, "I think." And we asked
- 4 him to go find something in the public, and he was unable
- 5 to do so.
- 6 Q. But he did tell you that he had used an Intel
- 7 network processor as part of his development platform;
- 8 isn't that correct? So, he was familiar with it.
- 9 A. But I'm unaware of what information was available
- 10 to him to use it at that high level.
- 11 Q. And he mentioned specifically it was the IXP line
- 12 of network processors from Intel, didn't he?
- 13 A. Yes, he did.
- 14 Q. The network processors that had the technology in
- 15 them before he conceived of anything and before he
- 16 applied for a patent; isn't that correct?
- 17 A. I don't know that.
- 18 Q. Now, Intel wasn't the only company that had no
- 19 interest in these patents; isn't that true?
- 20 A. That is true. It was offered to some companies,
- 21| yes.
- 22 Q. You started with hundreds of patents, and you just
- 23 simply were unsuccessful in monetizing them at all.
- 24 A. We entered into negotiations with a fair number of
- 25 companies.

- 1 Q. And only Stragent took a few patents.
- 2 A. That is true ultimately, yes.
- 3 Q. At a price that was lower than what you wanted?
- 4 A. We got -- in terms of the ongoing revenue stream,
- 5 15 percent was what we had hoped to get.
- 6 Q. But you also knew that the way to get that revenue
- 7 stream through a company like Stragent was to threaten
- 8 other technology companies, correct?
- 9 A. I would actually prefer if they had just licensed
- 10 the use.
- 11 Q. And you knew that the way they sold themselves to
- 12 you was by telling you they had a unique ability to find
- 13 hidden value in patents, correct?
- 14 A. I was not a party to any of those talks. I can't
- 15 comment on that.
- 16 Q. Okay. That was Mr. Howell that did that?
- 17 A. Yes, Houh.
- 18 Q. Houh. I'm sorry. I apologize. I'll get all of
- 19 these names wrong before the week is over, and I
- 20 apologize to everyone.
- 21 If you could look in the book that you have in
- 22 front of you at Defendant's Exhibit 150 and just see if
- 23 you remember seeing that back in 2008 when you were
- 24 selling these to Stragent.
- 25 A. 2008.

- 1 Q. There are plaintiff's exhibits with a red "P" --
- 2 or a blue "P" and then defense exhibits with a red "B" on
- 3 them, and this is 150.
- 4 A. 150.
- 5 Q. And it's on the screens as well.
- 6 A. That isn't what this is, 150. This isn't the tab
- 7 at --
- 8 Q. Is it a P or a D? I'm sorry. There's both in
- 9 there.
- 10 Well, let me just ask this. If you can look
- 11 at the screen, do you recognize that as something you
- 12 considered when you selected Stragent?
- 13 A. I didn't -- I never saw this at that time.
- 14 Q. Thank you.
- 15 So, the effort to monetize caused you to offer
- 16 these patents to IBM and they said no, correct?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. And to HP, and they said no?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. These are people who know a little bit not just
- 21 about computer chips but about networking and the like,
- 22 don't they?
- 23 A. They would seem to, yes.
- 24 Q. Okay. Verizon, your prior parent company, ran
- 25 networks; and it didn't want to keep these patents when

- l it let you go?
- 2 A. Verizon doesn't make any products to run networks.
- 3 Q. But it uses products, correct?
- 4 A. It does use products but --
- 5 Q. And the company that spun off when Verizon and GTE
- 6 merged, GTE Internetworking -- I think it was called --
- 7 that was a network company, correct?
- 8 A. It built networks, yes.
- 9 Q. And it was spun off without wanting to have this
- 10 technology.
- 11 A. Again, it didn't make products.
- 12 Q. Now, you said that you felt, from looking at the
- 13 patents, that there might be some value in the speed that
- 14 the patents would add to processing network protocol as
- 15 they come through?
- 16 A. Yes, I said that.
- 17 Q. Okay. This doesn't actually speed up how fast
- 18 data moves, does it?
- 19 A. No. It speeds up the verification of the packet
- 20 once it arrives at the device.
- 21 Q. It doesn't slow down as much, the data, as it
- 22 comes across the Internet.
- 23 A. It doesn't slow down the processing in the device.
- 24 Q. Well, even Mr. Milliken said in the patent that it
- 25 would slow down the device when you were choosing between

- two circuits. It would slow down --
- 2 A. I cannot comment on that. I don't recall what
- 3 Walter said.
- 4 Q. It says it in the patent, and I thought you
- 5 studied the patent.
- 6 A. I'd have to re-read that sentence to be sure, sir.
- 7| Q. Thank you.
- 8 THE COURT: Redirect?
- 9 MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 10 May it please the court?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF STEPHEN MILLIGAN

- 12 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 13 Q. Dr. Milligan, Mr. Burman asked you a lot of
- 14 questions about network processors. Was there anything
- 15 in claim 12 or claim 16 in that patent -- does it ever
- 16 use the word "network processor"?
- 17 A. Not when I read it, no. It used the word
- 18 "device."

- 19 Q. You also said that processors -- I think I wrote
- 20| this down right -- processors process packets. Is that
- 21 what you said?
- 22 A. Actually I think I said devices process packets.
- 23 Q. Okay. Devices process packets.
- Let me ask you this: Do processors, like
- 25 server processors -- do they process packets?

- 1 A. Yes, sir, as do all the rest of the computers in
- 2 this room.
- 3 Q. There is nothing unique about network processors
- 4 versus server processors with respect to processing
- 5 packets?
- 6 MR. BURMAN: Objection, leading.
- 7 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 8 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 9 Q. You can answer the question.
- 10 A. Many devices process packets. My iPhone processes
- 11 packets.
- 12 Q. He asked you -- Mr. Burman asked you questions
- 13 about this letter that was sent to companies and some
- 14 high-level categorizations. When BBN sent these packets
- 15 out, these requests for proposal, did it expect that the
- 16 companies would actually look at the patents themselves
- 17 and determine what they covered?
- 18 A. Yes. That would be the expectation.
- 19 Q. Could Walter Milliken or Steve Milligan or anyone
- 20| ever really know whether a Intel network processor had
- 21 two separate CRC circuits, each with its own hardwired
- 22 polynomial, and an instruction without looking at the
- 23 actual computer code that is confidential and proprietary
- 24 to Intel?
- 25 A. I do not believe so, no.

- 1 Q. Mr. Burman asked you questions about other
- 2 companies and their noninterest in the purchase of these
- 3 patents. Do you recall those questions?
- 4 A. Yes, I do.
- $\left[\mathsf{Q} \right]$. During the course of the negotiation among --
- 6 strike that.
- 7 Let me ask you this. Did other companies
- 8 initially show interest specifically in the patents that
- 9 are at issue in this case?
- 10 A. Yes, sir, they did.
- 11 Q. During the course of negotiations between BBN and
- 12 other companies, were there any concerns identified by
- 13 those companies concerning the prior ownership of BBN by
- 14 Verizon?
- 15 A. Yes. The split-up of BBN, BBN Planet, and Verizon
- 16| and ingenuity was -- it was a little messy and there were
- 17 some issues about which patents went with which company
- 18 and it took some years to actually resolve it.
- 19 Q. Were there also issues about whether Verizon had a
- 20 license or had granted licenses to those patents to other
- 21 companies?
- 22 A. Yes. There was residual concern about whether or
- 23 not they retained some rights to it.
- 24 Q. Did that seem to have an effect on other
- 25 companies?

- A. It did seem to cool off the negotiations, yes.
- Q. In this case nobody is saying that Intel has a license to these patents by virtue of Verizon?
- 4 A. Not to my knowledge, no.

- 5 Q. But back at the time of the sale, were there some 6 concerns in that respect, of other companies?
- 7 A. They expressed concern about whatever Verizon 8 might want.
 - MR. ALBRITTON: Pass the witness.
- 10 THE COURT: Anything further?
- 11 MR. BURMAN: Nothing further, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Now the jury should pass the
 sheets to the court security officer whether or not you
 have any questions.
- Okay. None of the jurors has a question. Is this witness excused or subject to re-call?
- MR. ALBRITTON: We would ask that he be excused, your Honor.
- 19 MR. BURMAN: That's fine, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Milligan.
- 21 You are excused.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
- THE COURT: Now you may call your next
- 24 witness.
- 25 MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor. The

- 1 plaintiff calls Walter Milliken by videotaped deposition.
- 2 The total time of the deposition, as edited, is 58
- 3 minutes. 30 minutes of that counts toward the plaintiff
- 4 and 28 minutes of that counts towards the defendant.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Video.

DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF WALTER MILLIKEN

- 7 Q. Good morning, Mr. Milliken.
- 8 A. Good morning.

- 9 Q. I would like you to begin today by having you
- 10 describe a little bit about your background. And if you
- 11 could first maybe just introduce the academic part of
- 12 your background by starting after high school and telling
- 13 us what you did.
- 14 A. Okay. I got my bachelor's degrees from Washington
- 15 University in St. Louis. I have a bachelor's of science
- 16 in EE and also a bachelor's of science in computer
- 17 science from 1977, year of graduation. I then had a
- 18 master's degree in EE from Stanford in 1978, technically
- 19 Leland Stanford Junior University, I think it is. That
- 20 was the extent of my formal education. I did not take a
- 21 PhD.
- 22| Q. I'd like to go through your employment history.
- 23 Maybe you could begin by telling us the first employment
- 24 that you had either during or after college.
- 25 A. During college, during the summers, I actually

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

worked in a small company that made power supplies in Dover, New Hampshire, did a couple of other things there with that same company. I actually designed some power supplies at that time, linear power supplies.

After I graduated from Stanford, I did consulting for a few months designing an electronic cash register, actually, building a microprocessor and basically everything.

And then I started with BBN in December of 1978; and I stayed there through 1998, I think it was December or might have been January of 1999. But I think I left in December of '98 to go through a spinout sort of BBN called Crescent Networks. And I was there for a bit over a year; and then I went back to BBN at the very end of May of 2000, I believe it was. And I stayed at BBN until I retired in the beginning of July of 2010. And since then I have done a little bit of consulting, but I have essentially retired at this point.

- 19 Q. So that I understand that question, including 20 through today, you have never designed silicon, *per se*?
- 21 Not at the design level. I've architected it but Α. 22 not designed.
- 23 Q. Okay. And what were you hired by BBN to do?
- 24 Α. Well, they were originally interested in me to 25

work on a UNIX project that they were doing at the time.

- 1 But I wound up actually being hired into their packet
- 2 satellite network research project.
- 3 Q. You mentioned that you left BBN with a spin-off
- 4 called "Crescent."
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And I did not capture the time period when that
- 7 was.
- 8 A. That would have been, I think -- I don't remember
- 9 exactly when I left. I think I left in November or
- 10 December of '98, spent the year of 1999 at Crescent; and
- 11 then as Crescent was finishing basically its architecture
- 12 phase, I went back to BBN at the end of, I think it was
- 13 May, started there at the very end of May of 2000. I was
- 14 CTO of Crescent Networks for a while.
- 15 Q. Just for the record, the exhibit bears a patent
- 16 number, U.S. 6,848,072. It lists an inventor, Walter
- 17 Clark Milliken of Dover, New Hampshire. Is that you?
- 18 A. That's me.
- 19 Q. The patent lists only one inventor.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And you've indicated that you are the Walter
- 22 Milliken noted here.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Did anyone else help you?
- 25 A. I don't recall specifically. I can tell you I

would expect that I was the sole inventor of this. I don't remember anybody else working on it, this particular one. There were a number of people working on the project. Several of the other patents had other people listed as co-inventors. But policy was we were inclusive as far as who was listed on patents. So, my expectation is I am the sole inventor. At the time we were pretty certain that I was the only person involved in the actual invention.

- 10 Q. Can you remember whether anybody else helped you 11 in connection with the work that is described in this 12 patent?
- A. There were a number of people who worked on the project. The project had a lot of different pieces. So in the sense that there -- yes, there were a number of people working with me on that design. As far as the actual invention goes, I don't recall specific details; but I don't recall anybody else having any input with
- Q. You have mentioned a couple of times in the answers you've just given me over the last couple of minutes "the project."
- 23 A. Yes.

19

24 Q. Did the project have a name?

this particular invention.

25 A. It had several different names depending on

- 1 whether you were talking about what people called it
- 2 informally or what the official name was in the job
- 3 system. I'm not sure I even remember the exact name it
- 4 had in the internal contracts database or the job system.
- 5 But it was generally referred to as the "iRouter" or the
- 6 "iNetworks router" or "Irvine Sensors router."
- $7\mid \mathsf{Q}.$ The Exhibit 2, the '072 patent -- are you
- 8 comfortable, by the way, referring to them by the last
- 9 three digits? Is that --
- 10 A. I'll get used to it. I'm not going to probably be
- 11 able to remember which of the patents of this family are
- 12 which but --
- 13 Q. Okay. Well, we'll try to do both. We'll say the
- 14 Exhibit 2, '072 patent.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. It has four figures at the beginning.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Did you prepare these figures?
- 19 A. No. Some of them may be derived from something I
- 20 might have provided, but I don't think I actually -- I
- 21 think the patent attorney may have drawn these from the
- 22 original design document, run them by me for approval.
- 23 Q. Did you approve them before they were submitted to
- 24 the Patent Office?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.

- Q. There are several columns of text -- Columns 1, 2,
- $2 \mid 3$, 4, 5, and the first part of 6 that have descriptive
- 3 material in there. Did you have a hand in preparing any
- 4 of that?
- 5 A. Yes. I don't believe the text itself was anything
- 6 I wrote directly. I certainly spent a fair amount of
- 7 time on all my patents going over the text that the
- 8 lawyers produced and making sure it was accurate and
- 9 making any corrections I thought were necessary.
- 10 Q. The patent concludes with a list of numbered
- 11| paragraphs that are called "claims." There are 22 of
- 12 them.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Did you have a role in coming up with the language
- 15 in the claims?
- 16 A. I believe the claims themselves -- the original
- 17| draft came from the patent attorney. I certainly
- 18 reviewed them, and I was -- knowing the importance of
- 19 claims, I generally review claims very carefully and made
- 20 sure I was happy with the wording.
- 21 On the other hand, I am an engineer and not a
- 22 patent lawyer; so, I was concerned with the technical --
- 23 what I saw as technical issues, not necessarily language
- 24 issues in claims.
- 25 Q. If I could have you open up the patent to the

- first figure, Figure 1.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Where is the switching fabric depicted in this
- 4 figure?
- 5 A. Well, there's one explicit indication of the
- 6 switch there, box 112. The network itself would contain
- 7 other switches.
- 8 Q. Where might the other switches be?
- 9 A. Depending on the network, generally they could be
- 10 anywhere from somebody's equipment closet to, you know,
- 11| sitting in a point of presence, a POP, in the Internet
- 12 core.
- 13 Q. There is a reference to a rectangle that is
- 14 divided up at the top of the figure. One part of the
- 15 rectangle is labeled "instruction store 203." Do you see
- 16 that?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. What is an instruction store?
- 19 A. It's generally a memory of some sort dedicated to
- 20 containing computer instructions.
- 21 Q. There is a reference to an "instruction sequencer
- 22 204 immediately under the instruction store. What is
- 23 that -- what is an instruction sequencer?
- 24 A. In a processor CPU, generally there is a component
- 25 that determines which instruction to fetch next and

- execute next. That's the element that is generally considered the instruction sequencer. It fetches instructions from the instruction store, and it feeds them to the rest of the machine with appropriate timing according to the logic of the program.
- Q. There is an arrow that proceeds from the bottom of the instruction sequencer to another set of lines running horizontally between the input and output register files.
- 9 What is that arrow down from the instruction sequencer 10 supposed to be showing?
- A. That would generally be indicating the
 dissemination of control data from the instruction, so
 pieces of the instruction being delivered to the various
 other units in the processor.
- 15 Q. I'd like to have you flip over to Figure 4 of the
 16 '072 patent. Can you explain what this figure is
 17 showing?
- A. I would have to look at the text to be sure what
 it's trying to show; but it is generally a picture of a
 CRC log, a fairly common way of depicting a CRC function
- 21 implementation.
- 22 Q. Is this hardware that's being depicted here?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. There is a reference at the bottom to an equation called a "polynomial." Can you tell us what that is?

- $oxed{1}$ $oxed{A}$. The polynomial is a mathematical function that is
- 2 being used on the input data. The theoretical
- 3 mathematics of it is a little beyond me. I don't
- 4 normally deal with that.
- 5 Q. I'd like to direct your attention now over to
- 6 Column 2. There is a section that begins with the
- 7 heading "Detailed Description."
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. In the second paragraph at about line 62 or '3,
- 10 there is a passage that reads, "One of the instructions
- 11 is a cyclic redundancy check (CRC) instruction. The CRC
- 12 instruction is implemented using hardwired CRC
- 13 polynomials."
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. I'm interested in the phrase "hardwired CRC
- 16 polynomials."
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. What is that?
- 19 A. Those would be polynomials that are implemented
- 20 biologic equations generally and then reduced to silicon
- 21 in some fashion.
- 22 Q. The phrase "hardwired" there sounds like it's sort
- 23 of baked in or fixed in the hardware. Is that what's
- 24 being talked about here?
- 25 A. The polynomials are not programmable nor

- configureable, just selectable.
- 2 Q. I'd like to direct your attention to the bottom of
- 3 Column 3. The last paragraph there, towards the middle
- 4 there is a passage that talks about the CRC algorithm
- 5 dividing. Do you see where I am generally referencing?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. The full sentence reads, "The CRC algorithm
- 8 divides this large value by a number (the CRC polynomial
- 9 or generator polynomial), leaving the remainder, which is
- 10 the CRC result."
- 11 A. Yes, I see that.
- 12 Q. Is it correct that the patent suggests that you
- 13 can produce a CRC result by dividing a number by the CRC
- 14 polynomial?
- 15 A. This is basically the theoretical definition of
- 16 CRCs, mathematical definition.
- 17 Q. Is there a different mathematical operation that
- 18 CRC could have?
- 19 A. I don't understand the mathematical theory behind
- 20 CRCs terribly well. I don't think of them as division.
- 21 Q. What do you think of them as?
- 22 A. Shift and XOR operations.
- 23 Q. Sort of like what is shown in Figure 4?
- 24 A. That's one implementation, yes.
- 25 Q. Is there a different way to implement shift and

- XOR than what is shown in Figure 4?
- 2 A. Yes. That's the serial implementation. There are
- 3 parallel implementations as well.
- 4 Q. Do the parallel implementations have a name?
- 5 A. They are generally just referred to as "parallel
- 6 designs."
- 7 Q. There is a passage near the top of -- well, you're
- 8 going to have to read the bottom part of Column 3 and
- 9 then the very first two lines of Column 4 to get the
- 10 context; and let me give you a second to do that.
- 11| My question is going to be whether or not
- 12 there is a typo in that sentence.
- 13 A. Yes, I see that.
- 14 Q. Is there a typo?
- 15 A. I believe so.
- 16 Q. Can you tell us the fix?
- 17 And let me just -- for the record, for
- 18 context, let me just read the passage in; and then you
- 19 can tell us how to fix it.
- "When the data is received (or recovered from
- 21 storage) the CRC operation can be reapplied, and the
- 22 latest result compared to the original result. If no
- 23 error has occurred, the CRC results should not match."
- 24 How would you fix that passage?
- 25 A. I believe the results are supposed to match, not

- 1 not match. The word "not," I believe, is spurious.
- Q. When you say spurious, you mean it shouldn't have
- 3 been there?
- 4 A. I believe that's correct. I would have to go back
- 5 and check the -- not all of these functions produce the
- 6 identical result in all cases, but I believe this is
- 7 in -- the way it's stated is incorrect.
- 8 Q. I want to direct your attention to Column 4 --
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. -- at about line 28.
- 11 A. The start of the paragraph?
- 12 Q. Yeah. If you could just take a second to read
- 13 basically that paragraph, I have a couple of questions
- 14 for you.
- 15 A. Okay. I've read the paragraph.
- 16 Q. This paragraph I take to be referring to Figure 3.
- 17 A. I believe so. Yes.
- 18 Q. And the passage at the top again is referring to
- 19 the "demultiplexer 301" which you indicated decodes
- 20 instructions.
- 21 A. That part of -- yes.
- 22 Q. Part of the decode operation is to ascertain that
- 23 a CRC operation is supposed to be performed, correct?
- 24 A. I don't believe that is the intent in this case.
- 25 Q. Why not?

- 1 A. I believe in the context of this picture, we're
- 2 now considering only the part of the instruction where it
- 3 has already been identified as being some sort of CRC
- 4 operation; and now we're just determining which one of
- 5 the CRCs to perform.
- 6 Q. So that the decoding operation would be -- which
- 7 of the CRC blocks should be used for the operation?
- 8 A. That is the decode operation that is being
- 9 performed there, I believe, yes.
- 10 Q. I'd like to direct your attention specifically to
- 11| the middle part of the same paragraph. It's about
- 12 line 32. Over to the right there is a sentence that
- 13 begins "Demultiplexer 301" --
- 14 A. Yes, I see it.
- 15 Q. -- "selects the appropriate one of the circuits
- 16 305-308 when the instruction indicates a CRC
- 17 instruction." Do you see that?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. Where in reference to Figure 3 would the
- 20 indication of a CRC instruction, the latter part of that
- 21 sentence, happen?
- 22 A. I'm sorry. I don't understand what you're asking.
- 23 Q. Okay. The sentence seems to suggest that the
- 24 demultiplexer selects the appropriate one of the circuits
- 25 when something happens, and the "when that happens" is

- the instruction indicates the CRC instruction.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. So, my question is: With reference to Figure 3,
- 4 when does that happen? When does the instruction
- 5 indicate a CRC instruction?
- 6 A. I believe in the context of the figure, that is
- 7 outside the scope of the figure slightly.
- 8 Q. There is another passage in the same paragraph.
- 9 It's down to about line 38. It says, "CRC circuits
- 10 305-308 may include two inputs" --
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. -- "input data and current state value data."
- 13 A. Yes. I see that.
- 14 Q. With reference to Figure 3, can you tell us where
- 15 those two inputs are depicted?
- 16 A. These are aggregated together in this picture.
- 17 Q. And where is the aggregation?
- 18 A. The input CRC data.
- 19 Q. Okay. So, that's supposed to indicate both
- 20 inputs?
- 21 A. I believe that is what is stated there.
- 22 Q. Okay. So, I just want to make sure I'm not
- 23 missing something else that would help us understand what
- 24| state data is. Is there anything else in the patent that
- 25 you're aware of that refers to state data or that would

- implicitly show what state data is or how it operates?
- 2 A. I'm sure there are references to state data. I'm
- 3 not sure if they clarified the situation further.
- 4 Q. What does it mean to have a polynomial hardwired 5 into a CRC circuit?
- 6 A. The form of the logic that is used to calculate 7 the CRC is dictated by that mathematical polynomial.
- 8 Q. And therefore what happens in the circuit
 9 implementation because of that fact?
- 10 A. The circuit implements a particular mathematical
- 11 logical operation that is dictated by that polynomial.
- 12 Q. The next step, the third step in claim 1, reads,
- 13 "receiving current CRC state data at the selected CRC
- 14 circuit."
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. In this context, what does "current" refer to
- 17 there?
- 18 A. The CRC operation may be performed in pieces; and
- 19 this is in the context of -- I might be partway through a
- 20 CRC calculation; and I have to reload the state,
- 21 reprovide the current state of the circuit to the logic.
- 22 Q. So, you're talking about an incremental
- 23 calculation?
- 24 A. The calculation is typically performed multiple
- 25 times on sub-blocks of the input data, and it may be

- interrupted in the middle.
- Q. And is that why you need the current CRC state data?
- 4 A. The performing a CRC operation implicitly is going 5 to have state data in some form somewhere, either present
- 6 in the circuit or it has to be supplied externally.
- 7 Q. Why do you say it necessarily must be there?
- 8 Couldn't you have a stateless implementation?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Why not?
- 11 A. It's an operation that requires multiple stages of
- 12 computation; and you can unroll them to a degree, perform
- 13 multiple and simultaneously.
- 14 Q. What about a CRC computation where you didn't need
- 15 to do it more than once, all you had to do it was just
- 16 once? Is it possible to implement that kind of a CRC
- 17 computation in a stateless model?
- 18 A. It would certainly not be a typical
- 19 implementation.
- 20 Q. But a possible one?
- 21 A. I don't think it would be a practical one
- 22 typically.
- 23 Q. You can't rule it out, though?
- 24 A. The state would still be present implicitly in
- 25 intermediate nodes of the circuit; but whether it would

- have an explicit memory device, it would be theoretically possible but extremely impractical.
- Q. Is there an implementation of this concept here in claim 6 that is shown in the patent anywhere?
- 5 A. It's not shown explicitly, no, not in the figures.
- 6 Q. Is it shown implicitly?
- 7 A. In Figure 3 the distribution of data to the units 8 could be interpreted that way.
- 9 Q. When you say "distribution of data to the units,"
- 10 I'm taking it to be referring to the arrow that proceeds
- 11 from input CRC data down and then there is a set of
- 12 arrows that go into the tops of the CRC functional box.
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. And why do you say that that could be interpreted 15 as a switch?
- 16 A. In standard practice in hardware engineering,
- 17 sometimes when you see a signal that is being distributed
- 18 to a lot of different units but you don't actually need
- 19 to do so, you don't want to do so because it causes
- 20 electrical issues, someone might put a switch there to
- 21 direct the data to the specific unit and not drive the
- 22 other ones.
- 23 Q. In July of 2000, what were you doing at BBN?
- 24 A. I was working on the iNetworks router project and
- 25 another project or two. I can't be sure exactly how many

- 1 I was working on at the time. I was certainly working on
- 2 the iNetworks project.
- 3 Q. Who is Craig Partridge?
- 4 A. Craig Partridge was the chief scientist for BBN in
- 5 network technology.
- 6 Q. Did you report to him?
- 7 A. Sometimes.
- 8 Q. Was he your boss?
- 9 A. For a very brief period I believe he was
- 10 technically my boss. BBN's management chain was kind of
- 11 complicated.
- 12 Q. You told us earlier today that you started back at
- 13 BBN after having left Crescent in May of 2000.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Was this iNetwork project underway by the time you
- 16 came back to BBN?
- 17 \mid A. They were just in the process of starting it.
- 18 Q. What were you asked to do first?
- 19 A. That's a hard question. Everything. Basically I
- 20 was tasked with trying to look at the problem that they
- 21 were proposing, the product they wanted to build, and
- 22 suggest architecture for it.
- 23 Q. What was the problem they were trying to solve?
- 24 A. They wanted to build a very high-end terabit speed
- 25 switch/router that would operate on any protocol known at

- 1 the time.
- Q. When you say "protocol," you're talking about a
- 3 communication protocol?
- 4 A. Yes. And that included conventional telephony as
- 5 well as Internet-type protocols.
- 6 Q. Did it include ATM?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Ethernet?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. When you say "telephony," what are you referring
- 11 to?
- 12 A. Standard PCM-TDM channel substructure telephone
- 13 signals.
- 14 Q. Why don't you do your best to tell me how you did
- 15 sort of break the problem down and then come up with the
- 16 solution that you came up with.
- 17 A. I remember I had to look at a lot of the protocols
- 18 involved early on and try to determine what requirements
- 19 they would place on the hardware, what things we would
- 20 have to do to them and we would have to extract them from
- 21 the channels and reassemble them. There were a lot of
- 22 bits and pieces and a lot of different protocols; so, I
- 23 spent some amount of time looking for commonality and how
- 24 could we build one device that would deal with a very
- 25 wide variety of protocols.

- 1 Q. What were the -- sort of the wishes or the2 expectations that were communicated from Irvine Sensors?
 - A. At a very high level what they wanted to build was what the industry referred to at the time as a "God box,"
- 6 Q. I take it the idea of a God box is not something 7 that BBN came up with. It was a larger concept?

a switch that would handle anything at high-speed.

- 8 A. There were a lot of people in the industry at the 9 time thinking about whether they wanted to build such a 10 thing, whether it was practical, whether it was
- commercially viable. So, the concept was understood. It was a convergence switch.
- Q. We're talking again about the start of your work after coming back to BBN in May of 2000, and you're starting to work on the iNetwork router project.
- 16 A. Yes.

3

- 17 Q. How far into that process did you start looking to
 18 see whether there might be something outside that you
 19 could use?
- A. That was very early on, and it didn't last very long because there wasn't anything out there that was even close. The speeds weren't available.
- Q. Let's just take the '072 patent, which is
 Exhibit 2, for a second. Are you able to say with
 reference to an event, when you conceived of the subject

- matter that is claimed in that patent?
- 2 A. The only way I can remember what dates things came
- 3 in is to look at various revisions of the documents from
- 4 the project and/or e-mails that reference some of the
- 5 things we were doing in the design. So...
- 6 Q. When you look at documents and you see dates on
- 7 them, I take you to be suggesting that you can reason
- 8 that things must have been such-and-such because you see
- 9 a date on a document.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. As opposed to having an independent recollection.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And I'm understanding you today to say that you do
- 14 not have an independent recollection of when you came up
- 15 with the ideas that are claimed in the '072 patent.
- 16 A. I know vaguely the time period; but to give you
- 17 any kind of specific date, I cannot.
- 18 Q. What is your vague recollection?
- 19 A. The summer of the year of 2000.
- 20 Q. Why do you put it in the summer of 2000?
- 21 A. Because most of the high-level details of the
- 22 architecture of that were pinned down somewhere in that
- 23 general time frame. And most of the preliminary design
- 24 work was done in the summer of 2000, the architecture and
- 25 preliminary design.

- 1 Q. Did the CRC functionality of the iNetwork router
- ever change over the course while you were working on it?
- 3 A. I don't remember any specifics about any changes.
- 4 I don't think it changed very much, if any.
- 5 Q. Do you remember any changes?
- 6 A. I don't recall any offhand, no.
- 7 Q. You say that "ALU will probably be 32 or 64 bits
- 8 wide. "Do you see that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. What is that a reference to?
- 11 A. The ALU of the network processor we were
- 12 designing.
- 13 Q. Is that the amount of data that could be handled
- 14 in one chunk by the ALU?
- 15 A. Yeah, the data width going into on which it
- 16 performed operations, whether it was going to be
- 17 natively -- what is typically referred to in the industry
- 18 for CPUs as the "width" of the data unit. At that time
- 19 32 was more common. 64 was wider than common.
- 20| Q. I would like to begin at the end chronologically,
- 21 which I think is the second paragraph. It refers to
- 22 iNetwork Corporation developing a cash flow shortage in
- 23 June of 2001. Do you remember that event?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. How did you find out about it?

- A. There was a general knowledge that they were seeking additional funding, I believe, through that period leading up to that because they were discussing it occasionally, about talking to outside finance. And then -- that had been ongoing for a while; and then the specific date here, I think, was the project manager was told to stop work and came around and told everybody to stop work on the project. That was sort of the formal point.
- 10 Q. And did you stop work?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Did you ever begin the work again?
- 13 A. I don't remember precisely. I remember there were
- 14 some stoppages and restarts occasionally. I think those
- 15 predate that final stop, but I can't be sure.
- 16 Q. At the time that the project was stopped, what was
- 17 the state of the development?
- 18 A. Most of the -- you know, the architecture work was
- 19 pretty much complete at that point. A lot of the
- 20 high-level design was complete. The simulator assembler,
- 21 I believe, were in progress and partially working but not
- 22 complete.
- 23 Q. This would be the simulator for the high-level
- 24 functional behavior?
- 25 A. That's correct, yes.

- 1 Q. So, a simulator for low-level hardware
- 2 functionality never was created?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. When you say "no," you're agreeing with me as
- 5 opposed to disagreeing with me?
- 6 A. We never did any -- built any hardware level 7 simulations stuff.
- 8 Q. And, in fact, you never actually designed the 9 hardware.
- 10 A. There's multiple levels of hardware design. We
- 11 did some degree of hardware design but not to the level
- 12 of actually starting to lay down gates or write code,
- 13 logic code.
- 14 Q. Do you know one way or the other whether Irvine
- 15 Sensors ever built a product that actually implemented
- 16 the ideas that are described and claimed in the
- 17 '072 patent, the '244 patent, or the '102 patent?
- 18 A. As far as I know, the project was abandoned midway
- 19 and no product was ever created.
- 20 Q. Do you know whether BBN ever built a product of
- 21 any kind that implemented the ideas that are disclosed
- 22 and claimed in those three patents?
- 23 A. I don't know of any such product, but BBN made a
- 24 great many things that I was not directly involved in.
- 25 It is entirely possible it might have been used

1 somewhere.

- 2 Q. If it was, you just don't know about it?
- 3 A. I do not know of any such thing.
- 4 Q. Mr. Milliken, from June, 2001, when the work on
- 5 the iRouter project was ended, through September 7th of
- $oldsymbol{6}$ 2001 when the application for the '072 patent was filed,
- 7 I take it there was no work that was being done in
- 8 connection with trying to build the ideas that you
- 9 disclosed and claimed in the '072, '244, and
- 10 '102 patents?
- 11 A. I can't recall any.
- 12 Q. You've been handed Exhibit 6 to the deposition.
- 13 Do you recognize this document?
- 14 A. Yes, I believe I recognize it.
- 15 Q. What is it?
- 16 A. I believe this is the provisional that we filed
- 17 that resulted ultimately in two different patents, one of
- 18 which is the CRC patent we've been discussing.
- 19 Q. Okay. I'd like to have you pick up Exhibit 2 if
- 20 you could.
- 21 A. Exhibit 2. That's the '072 patent?
- 22 Q. Yes.
- 23 A. Got it.
- 24 Q. On the first page there is a reference, under the
- 25 heading "Related U.S. Application Data," to a provisional

- application.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And it gives a number and a date. Is Exhibit 6 a
- 4 copy of that provisional application?
- 5 A. I don't believe I can verify that. I don't think 6 the provisional application -- oh, it is there. Okay.
- 7 Yes. Yes. This is the document that was the
- 8 provisional quoted here.
- 9 Q. I'd like to direct your attention to the page that
- 10 ends in the production code 1502. There is a paragraph
- 11 partway down the page that talks about the ALU providing
- 12 three flags. Do you see that?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And then right underneath that is another
- 15 paragraph that talks about the operations performed by
- 16 the ALU falling into four basic groups. Do you see where
- 17 I'm at?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Those four groups include arithmetic and logic
- 20 functions including priority-encode, CRC operations,
- 21 shift and extract operations, and pattern-matching
- 22 instructions, right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. I see on the next page there is also a reference
- 25 to functions that the ALU will support. There are four

- l listed there -- a CRC-32, a CRC-16, a CRC-10, and a
- 2 CRC-8, correct?
- 3 A. Correct, although there is another reference in
- 4 the CRC-8 one to an additional possible CRC function.
- 5 Q. Can you explain that? I'm not understanding what
- 6 you're saying.
- 7 A. The CRC-8 function has a note that there is a
- 8 basic CRC-8 function and there continued to be a variant
- 9 version of that which was used to decode certain things
- 10 in ATM protocols.
- 11 Q. There is a reference to SONET.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. What is that?
- 14 A. Synchronous Optical Network Equipment Transport.
- 15 I forget what the latter part of the acronym means.
- 16 Q. What is SONET used for?
- 17 A. SONET is a common low-level protocol for optical
- 18 data transmission, including telephony signals and
- 19 computer data.
- 20 Q. And that would be a different format than the ATM
- 21 protocol format?
- 22 A. No. It is an underlying layer to the ATM protocol
- 23 format typically.
- 24 Q. I don't see anywhere in the provisional
- 25 application that mentions hardwired polynomials in a CRC

- circuit. Do vou?
- 2 A. It doesn't say with the term "hardwired." It
- 3 references specific well-known polynomials that were used
- 4 in the standard protocols.
- 5 Q. So, the reference to "32," "16," "10," and "8"
- 6 next to "CRC" is a reference to a polynomial?
- 7 A. Those are -- that is shorthand for particular
- 8 polynomials that are of those lengths commonly used in
- 9 network protocols, yes.
- 10 Q. So, you're saying that CRC-32 is a reference to a
- 11| polynomial?
- 12 A. It is a reference to a specific polynomial applied
- 13 with a particular length of state data.
- 14 Q. And that would be true for CRC-8?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And 10?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. What's the reference to CRC-10? What polynomial?
- 19 A. I forget where that one is used. I think it may
- 20 be one of the ATM ones. I've forgotten. There is a
- 21 specific CRC-10 polynomial used in some common network
- 22 protocol. I think it was one of the ATM ones. I've
- 23 forgotten specifics.
- 24 Q. I want to make sure I understand this concept
- 25 completely. If we just focus on CRC-32, is it your

- testimony that CRC-32 refers to one and only one
- 2 polynomial?
- 3 A. That was the way I was using it in this document,
- 4 yes.
- 5 Q. Have you ever seen CRC-32 being used to describe
- 6 more than one polynomial?
- 7 A. I have only encountered a specific 32-bit CRC
- 8 function that is commonly used, and that's usually
- 9 referred to as "CRC-32."
- 10 Q. And what is that?
- 11 A. I couldn't quote you the polynomial.
- 12 Q. What about the application or protocol?
- 13 A. It's used in a great many protocols. It's the
- 14 commonly used CRC for high-speed network packet. It's
- 15 used in Ethernet. It's used in some versions of
- 16| Packet-Over-SONET. It's -- I'm trying to remember. It's
- 17 generally the preferred CRC polynomial for most of the
- 18 longer block length or higher bandwidth network protocols
- 19 these days.
- 20 Q. And CRC-8 here is a reference to a specific
- 21 protocol for use --
- 22 A. That was how I was using it there. That was a
- 23 particular requirement that we were satisfying to parse
- 24 that protocol.
- 25 Q. Before you did your work, had you ever studied

- 1 CRC-8 usages at all?
- 2 A. You mean in college?
- 3 Q. Yeah. Take that as an example.
- 4 A. I was aware of the existence of CRC functions, I'm
- 5 sure. I don't recall studying them in any detail.
- 6 Q. Do you think that there were hardwired CRC-8
- 7 polynomial systems in use before you did your work?
- 8 A. Before this patent -- the work this patent is
- 9 related to?
- 10 Q. Yes.
- 11 A. I would expect pretty much all of the CRC-8
- 12 polynomials being implemented in network equipment at
- 13 that time were done in hardwired circuits.
- 14 Q. And when you say "that time," you mean before you
- 15 did your work?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. So, you didn't invent the concept of using a
- 18 hardwired polynomial?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. You've been handed a document marked as
- 21 Exhibit 11. It begins with the production number
- 22 STRAG 000008976.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. A couple of other identifying features of the
- 25 document. At the top it has a heading, "Arithmetic Logic

- 1 Unit Instructions." There is a copyright date of 2001,
- 2 BBNT Solutions, LLC.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 5 A. I'm not entirely sure. I think I know what it is.
- 6 Q. Do you recall whether you participated in its
- 7 creation?
- 8 A. I believe this is a derived document from the
- 9 other document we were looking at that was done as part
- 10 of the work on the simulator.
- 11 Q. Since we have a lot of documents out on the
- 12 table --
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. -- could you find the one in the stack that you
- 15 are now referencing?
- 16 A. It would be derivative from some version of the
- 17| document that you have as Exhibit 9, although probably
- 18 one of the earlier ones in that particular instance. I'm
- 19 not sure.
- 20| Q. This document appears to go through instruction
- 21 formats; is that right?
- 22 A. That is what it appears to be to me, yes.
- 23 Q. Are these instruction formats that are consistent
- 24 with the idea that you came up with and then claimed in
- 25 the patents we've been talking about?

- A. Without studying it in detail, I can't say for
- 2 sure. Personally, it looks like it's the same stuff,
- 3 yes.

- 4 Q. There are a handful of pages from the production
- 5 number 8982 through 8985 that appear to relate to CRC.
- 6 A. Excuse me. 8982?
- 7 Q. Yes.
- 8 A. Through 8985, yes.
- 9 Q. These are CRC instructions?
- 10 A. Yes. That's what they appear to be.
- 11 Q. This document doesn't talk about the hardware,
- 12 does it?
- 13 A. It is not specifically a hardware design document.
- 14 It is related to the hardware design.
- 15 Q. Related in the sense that these are the
- 16 instructions and the format that the hardware is going to
- 17 work on?
- 18 A. This would be considered part of the specification
- 19 of the hardware.
- 20 Q. You wouldn't regard the specifications that are
- 21 here to be hardware design implementation details, would
- 22 you? For example, it doesn't show how to build the CRC
- 23 circuit?
- 24 A. That's correct. It does not dictate the
- 25 (indiscernible).

- Q. It doesn't talk about hardwired polynomials,
- 2 either?

- 3 A. It speaks to the fact that there are specific 4 polynomials that will be implemented.
- 5 Q. But it doesn't talk about them being hardwired as 6 opposed to being implemented in software, does it?
- 7 A. Hardwired can mean multiple things in context. I
- 8 believe in some sense it was being used partly as a
- 9 hardware. It will be implemented in logic equations. I
- 10 believe it is also being used as these are fixed
- 11 polynomials. They're not going to provide a variable
- 12 capability. These are fixed polynomials. There are a
- 13 specific set that were identified and implemented.
- 14 Q. When I hear the term "hardwired polynomial," I'm
- 15 thinking about a polynomial that is built into hardware
- 16 in a way that can't be changed.
- 17 A. It was certainly used in the sense that these are
- 18 not configureable or programmable functions, correct.
- 19 Q. So, you would refer to "hardwired polynomials" as
- 20 not the kind of polynomials implemented in software but
- 21 rather implemented so that they couldn't be programmable
- 22 or configureable?
- A. They were intended to be a specific set
- 24 unchangeable, permanently included in the hardware.
- 25 Q. After the provisional application was filed, did

- 1 you ever, you know, do anything further to look for
- 2 potentially relevant information about what was out
- 3 there?
- 4 A. I don't believe I took any further actions after
- 5 the provisional was filed related to the patent filing
- 6 until the drafts came back.
- 7 Q. When you say "the drafts came back," you're
- 8 referring to what?
- 9 A. The outside patent counsel actually giving us a
- 10 draft of the patent, the full patent filing.
- 11 Q. Aha. I see.
- 12 Were you involved at all in the process of
- 13 going back and forth with the PTO?
- 14 A. Indirectly.
- 15 Q. How so?
- 16 A. The patent -- it depended on the particular patent
- 17 and the patent attorneys prosecuting the case and the
- 18 examiner and various other circumstances. But often the
- 19 patent attorneys who are working on filing the patent
- 20 would call me with questions or send me e-mails with
- 21 questions or whatever, send me art that the examiner had
- 22 found and was questioning the patent relative to.
- 23 Q. Do you understand that you are being represented
- 24 here today?
- 25 A. Yes. I know that they are representing me here.

- 1 Q. And you understand that you are being represented
- 2 without being charged a fee?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Do you know who's paying the fee?
- 5 A. I do not know personally, no. I can suspect.
- 6 Q. And what is your suspicion?
- 7 A. I would assume Stragent is paying them.
- 8 Q. Do you have any kind of a consulting arrangement
- 9 where you are compensated for your time spent on this
- 10 case?
- 11 A. They have agreed to pay me for some of the time I
- 12 spent. It is not what I would call a "consulting
- 13 arrangement."
- 14 Q. Okay. And what are the terms of the agreement?
- 15 A. They are going to pay me my usual hourly rate for
- 16 the time it took the last couple of days.
- 17 Q. What is your usual hourly rate?
- 18 A. \$210 an hour.
- 19 Q. And how much total time will you be billing for?
- 20 A. About four and a half hours, I think.
- 21 Q. Four and a half hours total?
- 22 A. I believe so.
- 23 Q. What about for your time spent today?
- 24 A. I was told that I cannot be compensated for this
- 25 or the court time.

- 1 Q. Is the four and a half hours that you spent over
- 2 the last couple of days the only time that you've spent
- 3 on this case except for your testimony here today?
- 4 A. It's the only time I'm under contract to bill for.
- 5 Q. So, for example, the time you spent looking for
- 6 documents responding to the subpoena was --
- 7 A. I'm not billing for that, no.
- 8 Q. Are you entitled to any proceeds that may be
- 9 either awarded or paid as a result of this lawsuit?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. You understand that Intel Corporation is the
- 12 defendant?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Do you know which Intel products are at issue?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. You have no idea?
- 17 A. I was assuming it was the IXP series, but I have
- 18 been told that wasn't correct.
- 19 Q. Why do you assume it was the IXP series?
- 20 A. Because I originally identified that as being
- 21| infringement back when I was at BBN.
- 22 Q. Can you describe for me the circumstances that led
- 23 you to that conclusion?
- 24 A. I was working on another project that happened to
- 25 need a commercially available box with network processors

- $oxed{1}$ in it and we looked around and the Intel -- Intel had a
- 2 box with the IXP2800 in it and we wound up using that.
- And, of course, doing that, I read the -- was reading the
- 4 documentation and, lo and behold, it appeared that the
- 5 IXP2800 infringed on the patent.
- 6 Q. What about the IXP2800 led you to think that it
- 7 infringed on the patent?
- 8 A. It had a set of ALU instructions for CRC
- 9 functions.
- 10 Q. Do you remember which ALU CRC instructions it had?
- 11 A. I don't recall offhand except that there were
- 12 multiple of them because if it had been just CRC-32, I
- 13 wouldn't have considered it infringement.
- 14 Q. Do you recall when this happened?
- 15 A. Not off the top of my head, no.
- 16 Q. Did it make you curious?
- $17 \mid A$. In what way?
- 18 Q. To investigate a bit more about what was going on.
- 19 A. I merely noted it to BBN's intellectual property
- 20| people and went on with my work. I was busy doing other
- 21 things.
- 22 Q. Did you look for any other Intel products?
- 23 A. I don't believe I did.
- 24 Q. When you say you don't believe you did, is it that
- 25 you remember not doing it or you just don't have a

- recollection one way or the other?
- 2 A. I certainly don't remember doing anything like
- 3 that, and I don't believe I would have been doing
- 4 anything like that. It's not something I would have done
- 5 in the course of my work.
- 6 Q. There are lots of functions in a computer that
- 7 could be implemented through software, correct?
- 8 A. Generally, yes.
- 9 Q. Is it also generally true that you can perform
- 10 those functions more quickly if you create dedicated
- 11 hardware to do them?
- 12 A. As a general rule, hardware is faster than
- 13 software limitations, yes.
- 14 Q. When did you first learn that that was true?
- 15 A. Probably when I was in college.
- 16 Q. You're holding Exhibit 2 which is the '072 patent,
- 17 Figure 2, correct?
- 18 A. That is Figure 2. It's not an entire network
- 19 processor. It's the relevant subset of it.
- 20 Q. You don't claim to have invented network
- 21 processors, correct?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. And just in confining ourselves to the things that
- 24 are just shown in this figure, you don't claim to have
- 25 invented an instruction store?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Or an instruction sequencer?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. Or input register files?
- 5 A. Not the general concept of them, no.
- 6 Q. And not the general concept of output register
- 7 files?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Also not the concept of having both input register
- 10 files and output register files in a network processor.
- 11 You don't claim to have invented that either, correct?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. I'm correct, right?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 Q. I'm going to have you flip over to Figure 3.
- 16 Figure 3 is showing details of an ALU, correct?
- 17 A. Of a piece of an ALU, correct.
- 18 Q. Right. It's not the entire ALU but potentially
- 19 relevant features of an ALU for your patent.
- 20 A. A subcomponent of it, yes.
- 21 Q. Up at the upper left-hand corner, there is a
- 22 reference to CRC instructions. Do you see that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. You don't claim to have invented the concept of
- 25 CRC instructions, do you?

- 1 A. Not the notion of having a CRC instruction, no.
- 2 Q. There are four different CRC circuits -- is that
- 3 true -- depicted as functional blocks in this figure,
- 4 correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. I want to focus first just on CRC-32. Okay?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. You don't claim to have invented the idea of
- 9 having a CRC-32 circuit with a hardwired polynomial in
- 10 it, do you?
- 11 A. No. Those are -- that is correct. Those are
- 12 preexisting art.
- 13 Q. And the same would be true of the CRC-16 circuit?
- 14 A. As an individual circuit, correct.
- 15 Q. The same would be true of the CRC-10 circuit?
- 16 A. I believe so.
- 17 Q. The same would also be true of the CRC-8 circuit?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. You have shown a Demux, box 301. Just focusing on
- 20 the idea of a Demux that is decoding an instruction, you
- 21 don't claim to have invented that idea, do you?
- 22 A. Decoding to one of N is well-known.
- 23 Q. What would you say you did invent that is shown on
- 24 Figure 3, if anything?
- 25 A. The gist of the invention, I would describe it as

- 1 being able to process multiple protocols by virtue of
- 2 having multiple functional blocks that could be used for
- different protocols at different times or in combination.
- 4 Q. So, it's the idea of having the CRC-8, the CRC-10,
- 5 the CRC-16, and the CRC-32 available as choices in the
- 6 ALU?
- 7 A. To have multiple CRC instructions as part of the
- 8 ALU, main ALU, yes.
- 9 Q. The same would be true of buses?
- 10 A. It would depend on the specifics of the bus.
- 11 There are patented buses. But the concept of a bus, no.
- 12 I did not invent the concept of a bus.
- 13 Q. How about the concept of comparing a CRC result to
- 14 zero? Did you invent that concept?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. That's one of the well-known ways of using a CRC.
- 17 A. I believe that is the standard output result of a
- 18 CRC. (Video deposition concluded.)
- 19 MR. ALBRITTON: That concludes that
- 20 presentation.
- 21 THE COURT: Would this be a good time for our
- 22 afternoon break?
- 23 MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir.
- 24 THE COURT: Why don't we take a break now and
- 25 we'll return in 15 minutes, which would be 20 minutes of

```
210
1
   4:00.
2
              (Recess, 3:23 p.m. to 3:42 p.m.)
3
              (Open court, all parties present, jury
4
   present.)
5
              THE COURT:
                           Okay. Mr. Albritton, you can
6
   continue.
7
              MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor.
                                                        The
8
   plaintiff calls Henry Houh.
9
              Your Honor, may I approach?
10
              (The oath is administered.)
                               May I approach, your Honor?
11
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                           Yes.
12
              THE COURT:
13
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                               Thank you very much, your
14
   Honor.
15
              May it please the court?
16
                DIRECT EXAMINATION OF HENRY HOUH
17
               CALLED ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF
   BY MR. ALBRITTON:
18
19
   Q.
          Dr. Houh, please introduce yourself to the jury.
          My name is Henry Houh. That's spelled H-O-U-H.
20
   Α.
21
          I guarantee you those court reporters appreciate
   Q.
22
  that.
23
              Tell us a little bit about your family,
  Dr. Houh.
24
25
          I'm married, 17 years now. I have three children,
   Α.
```

- $oxed{1}$ age 14, 12, and 9, a boy and then two girls.
- 2 Q. How old a man are you?
- 3| A. I'm 46 years old.
- 4 Q. And where do you live, Dr. Houh?
- 5 A. I live in Lexington, Massachusetts.
- 6 Q. Where is Lexington, Massachusetts?
- 7 \mid A. \mid It's a suburb of Boston, about 10 miles northwest.
- 8 Q. Dr. Houh, what do you currently do for a living?
- 9 A. I do some consulting, but I spend the bulk of my
- 10 time on a new business I started. It's called
- 11 "Einstein's Workshop."
- 12 Q. If you would, tell the ladies and gentlemen of the
- 13 jury about Einstein's Workshop.
- 14 A. It's an educational business I started to teach
- 15 science, technology, engineering, art, and math to kids
- 16 of all ages, from preschool all the way through adult.
- 17 Q. About how many kids are involved in Einstein's
- 18 Workshop?
- 19 A. Over the past year we probably had two or 3,000
- 20 kids involved, and we maybe have 200 to 300 kids that are
- 21 coming every week for regular classes plus another 100 to
- 22 150 for -- dropping in to explore.
- 23 Q. Okay. Dr. Houh, are you an inventor?
- 24 A. I am.
- 25 Q. How many United States patents do you have?

- A. I have six.
- Q. Dr. Houh, where did you go to undergraduate
- 3 school?
- 4 A. I went to MIT. That's the Massachusetts Institute
- 5 of Technology.
- 6 Q. And what did you study as an undergraduate at MIT?
- 7 A. I have two undergrad degrees. One is a physics
- 8 degree which I received in 1989, and I have a degree in
- 9 electrical engineering and computer science which I
- 10 received in 1990.
- 11 Q. Dr. Houh, where did you go to graduate school?
- 12 A. I stayed at MIT for graduate school.
- 13 Q. Tell us about your -- what degrees ultimately you
- 14 received from MIT graduate school.
- 15 A. I ultimately received a PhD from MIT in electrical
- 16 engineering and computer science in 1998.
- 17 Q. Dr. Houh, while you were at MIT, were you involved
- 18 in any activities that ultimately were made into a book
- 19 and then later into a movie?
- 20 A. I was.
- 21 Q. Tell the jury about that.
- 22 A. I was part of what was known as the "MIT Blackjack
- 23 Team."
- 24 Q. And tell us about the book and the movie.
- 25 A. The book was written about the team in general but

- one particular player and it was called "Bringing Down
- 2 the House" and that was made into a movie called "21."
- 3 Q. Did you actually appear in the movie?
- 4 A. I did, yes.
- 5 Q. Now, are you the one who said, "Winner winner
- 6 chicken dinner"?
- 7 A. That was one of my lines.
- 8 Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Houh, I want to talk to you about
- 9 what you started doing for work at the end of your time
- 10 at MIT and what you did immediately upon getting your
- 11| PhD.
- 12 A. I started working before I finished my PhD at a
- 13 company called NBX.
- $14 \mid Q$. And what is NBX?
- 15 A. It stood for "Network Base Exchange," and we built
- 16 phone systems that were -- that ran -- you know, business
- 17 phone systems that ran over a data network like the one
- 18 that might be in your office instead of regular phone
- 19 lines.
- 20 Q. What were your job duties there at NBX?
- 21 A. So, I was a senior scientist and engineer and I
- 22 designed some of the reliable protocols in order for the
- 23 phones to get messages to start calls and things and I
- 24 also designed the way that audio gets reconstructed so
- 25 that you can hear it well with low delay. And I also

- converted the system to use the Internet protocol.
- 2 Q. Who had founded NBX?
- 3 A. There was a classmate of mine named Alex Laats who
- 4 was a physics major and also a double major, and he
- 5 started the company. He started the company.
- 6 Q. Now, was NBX ultimately purchased by another
- 7 company?
- 8 A. It was ultimately purchased by a company called
- 9 3Com.
- 10 Q. And how long did you work at NBX and 3Com?
- 11 A. I was there about a year and a half to a little
- 12 under two years, somewhere around there.
- 13 Q. Where did you go after that, Dr. Houh?
- 14 A. I went to a company called Teradyne.
- 15 Q. Now, what is a "teradyne"?
- 16 A. Well, a "dyne" is a unit of work; and "tera" is a
- 17| trillion. So, I guess it means lots of work.
- 19 Dr. Houh?
- 20 A. I was responsible for looking at some of the
- 21 divisions that Teradyne had acquired in the recent years
- 22 that I was there, and they were doing software testing.
- 23 Teradyne itself had a long history of doing hardware
- 24 semiconductor testing, making big machines to test big
- 25 chip wafers as they come off the production line. But

- 1 the chairman of the company had the idea that they should
- 2 get into software testing and, so, started to acquire
- 3 some companies and my responsibilities were to work for
- 4 those software test divisions and see if there were any
- 5 missing products or evaluate strategically, you know, how
- 6 to position them in the market.
- 7 Q. Now, was your work primarily business in nature or
- 8 technical in nature?
- 9 A. It was actually a mix of both; so, it was a lot of
- 10 fun for me.
- 11 Q. Did Teradyne spin out another company?
- 12 A. Yes. It actually packaged up those divisions and
- 13 spun it out to a company known as Empirix.
- 14 Q. Did you go to work at Empirix?
- 15 A. I did, yes.
- 16 Q. What was your job title at Empirix?
- 17 A. I started as director of business development, and
- 18 I eventually became chief technologist of two different
- 19 divisions. And then I actually helped architect and lead
- 20 the development team on a new product in data testing
- 21 which was one of the gaps that I had identified.
- 23 opportunity to reconnect with your classmate and former
- 24 boss Alex Laats?
- 25 A. I did, yes.

- 1 Q. If you would, tell the members of the jury about
- 2 that.
- 3 A. Alex at the time was at a venture capital company.
- 4 Q. Now, what is a venture capital company, Dr. Houh?
- 5 A. A venture capital company is a company that raises
- 6 money and then the partners at the venture capital
- 7 company invest it in businesses, and this particular
- 8 company that Alex was at focused on kind of early-stage
- 9 startups. So, the venture capitalists would help invest
- 10 money in the company -- help the company grow and
- 11 hopefully sell the company.
- 12 Q. Did you and Mr. Laats have an opportunity to go to
- 13 work at BBN together?
- 14 A. Yes. So, BBN was one of the opportunities he was
- 15 looking at when I was working with him there. Our plan
- 16 was to do a start-up together; and even though BBN wasn't
- 17 a start-up the way you think of most start-ups, it was a
- 18 very good opportunity for both of us.
- 19 Q. Now, why is that? Had BBN just undergone any
- 20 significant ownership changes at that time?
- 21 A. It did actually. Prior to us joining BBN, BBN was
- 22 owned by Verizon.
- 23 Q. The telephone company?
- 24 A. Yes, that's right.
- 25 Q. All right. And were these venture capital

- companies involved in purchasing BBN from Verizon?
- 2 A. Yes. So, Verizon was looking to sell BBN and the
- 3 venture capitalists were very interested in buying BBN.
- 4 BBN had a long, storied past and one of the lead venture
- 5 capitalists on it knew about the long, storied past and
- 6 he thought not only could they buy it but also create new
- 7 companies out of it.
- 8 Q. Yeah. So, what was the ultimate goal of the
- 9 venture capitalist firms that purchased BBN?
- 10 A. So, the ultimate goal is that they would purchase
- 11 BBN, help grow BBN, and then sell BBN.
- 12 Q. What were your role and the role of Alex Laats at
- 13 BBN?
- 14 A. So, as I mentioned, BBN had a long history of
- 15 technological innovation and research and development and
- 16 it had built things like the first data network, packet
- 17 data network. It had sent the first e-mail between
- 18 computers. It had done, you know -- it had the best
- 19 speech recognition system that had developed. And a lot
- 20 of those opportunities were not eventually commercialized
- 21 by BBN. They were commercialized by many other
- 22 companies.
- 23 Q. Well, what was going to be your new role at BBN
- 24 and Mr. Laats' new role at BBN?
- 25 A. So, our roles -- and Alex was the division

president and I worked for Alex and our roles were to basically look at the technology and intellectual property and the software and the prototypes that were developed under contracts and see if there was a way we could actually turn them into companies or otherwise commercialize them.

- Q. Okay. Dr. Houh, if you would just back up slightly. We're getting a little bit of a pop every minute or two.
- 10 A. Sorry.
- 11 Q. And maybe slow down just a hair for the court 12 reporters if you would.
- 13 A. Sorry.

15

16

- 14 Q. That's okay.
 - So, after -- when you and Mr. Laats joined BBN, did BBN have a large portfolio of issued United States patents as well as pending patent applications?
- 18 A. Yes. It did end up with a lot of patents.
- 19 Actually a very large number of what -- for what I think
 20 a company of that size would have, and it had over a
- 21 hundred maybe 150 or more issued patents and four or 500
- 22 patents pending at the time.
- Q. Well, how did the new ownership group, this group of venture capital firms -- how did they view this group of patents and pending patent applications?

- Well, you know, they were assets. Α. You know, they 2 were things that you have like property. But some of the patents were -- we had just too many and we had a fixed patent budget and we actually had to figure out -- but they looked at that as part of the intellectual property and part of the things that eventually we could grow into companies, some of the ideas or otherwise make money off 8 the patents.
- So, what was your -- what were you charged with doing with respect to this patent portfolio?
- 11 So, we actually looked at breaking up the patents into several different categories. There was like a 12 13 committee of us that was formed to actually work on the patent committee. 14
- 15 So, what types of folks were on this patent committee? 16
- 17 I was on the committee. Other of my peers, my boss Alex; the general counsel; Steve Milligan, the chief 18
- 19 technology officer. We were all on the patent committee.
- 20 Q. And what did you and the rest of your folks
- on the patent committee do? 21
- 22 Well, we looked at the various patents; and we Α. 23 broke them into various categories.
- 24 Well, let's talk about that. About how Q. many different categories or different ways did you 25

220

categorize the patents in the BBN patent portfolio?

- A. There were about three different kind of categories or buckets we had.
- 4 Q. Okay. Well, if you would, explain to the ladies
 5 and gentlemen of the jury sort of what was Bucket
 6 Number 1 and what was your intention.
- 7 A. So, the first bucket was, you know, patents that
 8 were very important for BBN to continue doing its
 9 research and continue to kind of secure more research
 10 contracts critical to the departments in that we would
 11 need them in order to continue to perform their work.
- 12 Q. Okay. What about the second bucket of patents 13 identified?
- A. The second bucket we looked at and said, well, we may have some existing things that we could commercialize and we would like to package those patents up along with the operating company and either run it in-house or spin out the company and raise some external money with an entire kind of start-up spinout.
- Q. If you would, give the juries an example -- let's see, give the members of the jury an example of what y'all did with these sorts of patents and technology.
- A. So, we had a little group that had done a little
 bit of work for some commercial entities before and as a
 result got a patent, one we called the "Trombone." It

wasn't really about the instrument. It was kind of a "technicalese" thing.

But what we did with that was we actually set up a company, internal effort. We built a software service around some of the technology in the patents and the technology that we had had including --

- 7 Q. Back up just a hair. You're still kind of --
- 8 A. -- including the speech recognition system and we
 9 actually released a product that would help call centers
 10 improve their operations and efficiency.
- 11 Q. Now, what was the name of that company?
- 12 A. That was called "Avoke," and companies like Dell used that product.
- 14 Q. Now, Avoke, if you would spell that for the court 15 reporter.
- 16 A. A-V-O-K-E.
- 17 Q. Okay. And was that turned into its own company?
- 18 A. It's still operating within Raytheon today, within
- 19 BBN.

2

3

4

- 20 Q. Okay. How much money annually is that making?
- 21 A. I heard last year they had revenues in excess of
- 22 20-some million dollars a year.
- 23 Q. Okay. Now, were there other companies or other
- 24 projects that BBN developed around some of its patented
- 25 technology?

- A. Yes. So, there was another project called
- 2 "Boomerang."
- 3 Q. Tell the -- the jury has heard a little bit about
- 4 it. We don't need enormous detail, but tell us about
- 5 that.

- 6 A. Boomerang was developed under our research
- 7 contracts as some theories and, prior to Alex and I
- 8 getting there, was actually manufactured using in-house
- 9 labor, the scientists on -- for example, over
- 10 Thanksgiving weekend, I believe they came and assembled
- 11 and soldered 50 to 100 units of this. But we undertook
- 12 an effort to figure out how to manufacture these on our
- 13 own and set up actual, you know -- redesigned, you know,
- 14 package product as well as figuring how to get them
- 15 manufactured and get them sold.
- 16 Q. And who was the customer for these Boomerang
- 17 systems?
- 18 A. Well, it was a sniper detection system. So, the
- 19 customer was the U.S. -- the government, the Army.
- 21 A. I did. I ran engineering as an -- on an interim
- 22 basis.
- 23 Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Houh, has BBN continued to sell
- 24 and make money off of this bucket of technology, for
- 25 instance, the Boomerang?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 1 A. Yes. The Boomerang had a number of patents
 2 associated with it as well as the product; but to date
 3 it's sold over a quarter billion dollars' worth of
 4 Boomerangs, over 10,000, I think, of them.
- Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Houh, was there another bucket of patents and technology that were put into companies that were ultimately spun out?
 - A. There was. And there was an effort and a spinout that we created using BBN's speech recognition technology and software. I actually worked on this, too, to help write the prototype. We created an audio and video search engine because the search engines that are out there only recognize the text that's on the page but because we could do speech recognition we could actually listen to the words that were spoken inside audio and video files and build a pseudo transcription of the audio and video file and then that allowed people to search those audio and video files for spoken words.
- 19 Q. Now, did that become -- did that core technology20 in those patents become a company?
- 21 A. Yes. In fact, it got spun out, had a different 22 name back then but today it's known as RAMP, ramp.com.
- Q. Okay. And who are some of the customers of RAMP?
- 24 A. So, the customers are all the major media
- 25 companies -- CBS, NBC, ABC, Reuters, ESPN, and probably a

- bunch of others as well.
- 2 Q. So, what we've been talking about so far were ways
- 3 that BBN -- you and Mr. Laats came in and helped BBN make
- 4 money off of its patented technology.
- 5 A. Right.
- 6 Q. Now, was there another way, another strategy that
- 7 BBN had that you were involved with related to the
- 8 monetization or the making of money related to BBN
- 9 patents and technology?
- 10 A. Yes, there was.
- 11 \mid Q. \quad If you would, tell the members of the jury about
- 12 that.
- 13 A. Well, we had looked into also setting up a
- 14 licensing program or potentially selling patents as well.
- 15 Q. Now, what do you understand to be a licensing
- 16 program?
- 17 A. A licensing program is where someone -- someone
- 18 might be using the techniques that are developed and
- 19 claimed in the patent and they would pay for the right to
- 20 use your invention.
- 21 Q. So, would it be -- BBN, for instance, could go out
- 22 and ask other companies to pay for a license to use
- 23 patents?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. I want to talk to you about the time when you

- 1 first came to BBN. When you first came to BBN, did you
- 2 have any experience that informed your decision about
- 3 whether to either affirmatively license patents or to
- 4 sell patents?
- 5 A. Well, during the time that I was at BBN, I did
- 6 have that experience.
- $\mathsf{7} \mid \mathsf{Q}.$ Tell the members of the jury about that, please,
- 8 sir.
- 9 A. So, Verizon, who used to own BBN at the time, came
- 10 to us and they had -- Verizon spends like a billion
- 11 dollars on research and development every year, and they
- 12 have their own very large portfolio. They didn't give
- 13 all of their patents to us, just some of them.
- 14 But it was looking to assert them against
- 15 another company.
- 16 Q. Now, what do you mean? What happened with this
- 17 assertion of this patent or these patents?
- 18 A. Well, they wanted to sue another company.
- 19 Q. Okay. So, was there, in fact, a lawsuit with
- 20 Verizon?
- 21 A. There was, yes.
- 22 Q. And what was that lawsuit -- who were the parties
- 23 to that?
- 24 A. Verizon was suing Vonage.
- 25 Q. Okay. And what is Vonage?

- 1 A. Vonage is a company that delivers phone services
- over the Internet. So, you don't have to have a phone
- 3 line anymore. You can plug it into your Internet
- 4 connection, and you'll get a dial tone.
- 5 Q. Now, this lawsuit happened a number of years ago.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. What was your role or how were you involved in
- 8 that. Dr. Houh?
- 9 A. So, because I had had voice-over-IP experience at
- 10 this prior company NBX, I ended up as an expert witness
- 11 for Verizon working on that patent trial.
- 12 Q. Now, are you here as an expert witness in this
- 13 case?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. Why are you here?
- 16 A. I have some knowledge of the facts that led up to
- 17 this dispute.
- 18 Q. Now, was your new job at BBN -- did you consider
- 19 that -- was that one of the reasons you took this job as
- 20 an expert in that *Verizon versus Vonage* lawsuit?
- 21 A. It was. I felt that if we got some experience to
- 22 see what it takes to run an active litigation, that would
- 23 help inform our strategy.
- 24 Q. And "litigation," you mean lawsuit?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Now, what was your takeaway, Dr. Houh?
 What did you learn as a result of working as an expert
 witness in that Verizon versus Vonage case?
- 4 A. So, my takeaway from that case was that it was 5 very, very expensive and very, very risky.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. So, how did that inform your decision and BBN's decision with what to do with this next group of patents that we're talking about?
 - A. So, you know, we had looked at maybe setting up an active licensing program; but you need to be able to have some, you know, enforcement, you know, behind it if you are actually going to be able to succeed. And we felt that BBN really wasn't set up the way it was doing government contracts. We didn't want to be known as an enforcement company. It was very expensive potentially with uncertain outcome; so, it's not something that we thought the venture capitalists would undertake and certainly not our management team either.
- 19 Q. Okay. So, what did BBN -- you and Mr. Laats and
 20 the other folks at BBN decide to do with this third
 21 bucket of patents that you identified as having value?
- A. So, we decided that we would try to sell them or potentially work with another company on licensing them.
- 24 Q. Okay. And, so, what did y'all do in that respect?
- 25 A. So, we took all those patents we thought were

- valuable and we didn't need to use in-house or in the company, and we categorized them. We identified a number of companies to send out a request for proposals to.
- 4 Q. Now, was this categorization, was that just a 5 high-level data categorization?
- A. Yes. It was things like these are patents about networking, these are patents about compute, these are patents about speech recognition.
- 9 Q. Okay. Dr. Houh, you said that you put together a 10 request for a proposal. Tell the ladies and gentlemen 11 about that.
- 12 So, once we had identified all the patents in this 13 category and we put together a booklet, the booklet had a 14 copy of the first page of every patent. It also had a 15 copy of -- we typed them -- of claim 1 in the patent which is what the first thing it's claiming. 16 And for 17 every patent we had these two pages. We put them in a We bound it. We added a cover letter. 18 book. We added 19 the list of all the patents in the categories, and we sent it out to a number of companies. 20
- 21 Q. Now, you said it was this high-level category.
- 22 You actually sent the patents that have the claims in
- 23 them as well?
- A. Yes. We had a sheet with the first claim, not all of the claims. But if people were interested and wanted

- to follow up, they could easily look them up online.
- Q. Are the claims what define the scope of the 3 invention?
- 4 A. Yes.

- Q. Let's talk for a second, Dr. Houh, before we get into a little more of the details there. Was there a last category of patents that BBN identified, and what did BBN do with those patents and patent applications?
 - A. Yes, there was; and it was the patents that may have helped us solve a very specialized problem but we didn't feel had a lot of value since it was a very, very narrow patent.
- 13 Q. Okay. And what did BBN do with those patents?
- A. Eventually the issued ones we stopped paying the issue fees. We made a note next time there is a fee due we would not do it, and that effectively abandons it and actually gives the invention to the public.
- 18 Q. For those groups of patents, why did BBN do that?
 19 What was the driving force?
- A. Well, the driving force was that, you know, they
 were -- they cost money to maintain. You have to
 actually pay a maintenance fee every four or five years
 or something like that. And then we didn't feel that
 there was -- the problem was big enough that people would
 be interested in a license to that invention.

- 1 Q. Okay. So, what category of these patents that
- 2 you've just talked about did the patents in this case
- 3 fall into?
- 4 A. These were the valuable ones that were important
- 5 in IP for sale or license.
- 6 Q. If you would, look in your binder, Dr. Houh,
- 7 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, and
- 8 Plaintiff's Exhibit 3. If you would, just on a high
- 9 level look at those and tell the members of the jury what
- 10 those are.
- 11 A. Those look like the -- those are the patents that
- 12 were in the RFP that were eventually sold.
- 13 Q. Okay. And Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 and Plaintiff's
- 14 Exhibit 2 are the patents that are specifically at issue
- 15 in this case; is that right?
- 16 A. That's my understanding, yes.
- 17| Q. What sorts of companies did BBN send these
- 18 requests for proposals?
- 19 A. We actually sent the proposal to a couple
- 20 different categories, one of them being companies that --
- 21 big companies that often like to amass their own patents
- 22 and buy others for maybe defensive purposes.
- 23 We also looked at companies that were buying
- 24 patents and then grouping them together and licensing
- 25

them.

And there was another category where they would help us directly help figure out how to license.

- Q. Okay. So, if you would, give an example of the types of companies BBN contacted in each of those categories.
- 6 A. So, the company category, we sent RFPs to HP, 7 Qualcomm, Intel, I think Palm.
- And in the licensing category there was a company called "Acasia."
- In the "we buy them" category, I think there
 was a company that was a group formed by Intellectual
 Ventures.
- 13 Q. Okay. And what is Intellectual Ventures?
- 14 A. They create and buy lots of patents, and they15 group them together for specific clients of theirs for
- 16 licensing purposes and share joint licensing or something
- 17 like that.

1

- 18 Q. Did Acasia, for instance, one of these licensing
- 19 companies, and Intellectual Ventures or an Intellectual
- 20 Ventures entity express interest specifically in the
- 21 patents that are at issue in this lawsuit, the '072 and
- 22 the '244 patent as well as the related '102 patent?
- 23 A. Yes, they did.
- 24 Q. If you would, please go to Plaintiff's Exhibit 48,
- 25 sir.

A. Okay.

1

12

Q.

- Q. All right. Dr. Houh, if you would, tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what this is.
- 4 A. This is a cover letter that actually went out with every RFP and actually it's a generic, but it's actually customized for every group we sent it to.
- Q. Okay. So, if you would, who is -- what's the date of this letter and to whom was it sent?
- 9 A. This one is dated November 19th, 2007; and it was
 10 sent to D. Bruce Sewell, S-E-W-E-L-L, the senior
 11 vice-president general counsel of Intel.
- paragraph. Tell us generally -- you certainly don't need to read it word-for-word, but tell us what that paragraph

Now, if you would, let's look at the first

- 15 is talking about and what you were telling Intel.
- 16 A. Well, it introduces BBN as, you know, a storied
 17 research and development company that, you know, we had
- 18 held built the ARPANET which led to the Internet and we
- 19 had done a lot of great work and these are all the
- 20 different areas we've done all this research and
- 21 development in.
- 22 Q. Okay. Now let's look at that next paragraph.
- 23 What does it relate to?
- 24 A. Then it's talking about our 200 patents with many
- 25 more pending, and it's talking about the categories of

patents that are in this RFP.

- Q. So, the 200 or so patents we're talking about
- 3 here, those are the patents in the bucket that you and
- 4 your colleagues at BBN decided was best to try to sell or
- 5 license; is that right?
- 6 A. Yes -- well, I don't know -- I mean, it says we
- 7 built a portfolio of over 200. I don't think they were
- 8 all up for sale so --
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 A. It's just the ones in the RFP.
- 11 Q. The ones that were attached.
- 12 Okay. Then if you would, let's look at the
- 13 next paragraph, please, sir.
- 14 A. Okay. This is where we're talking about we're
- 15 looking for proposals for license or sale of certain
- 16 portions of our patent portfolio.
- 17 Q. Okay. If you look here, it says "a variety of
- 18 compensation structures." What are you talking about in
- 19 terms of compensation?
- 20 A. Well, we were looking for kind of an ongoing
- 21 royalty in any case of any potential revenue that might
- 22 be generated from a patent.
- 23 Q. Now, why was it important to BBN to have an
- 24 ongoing source of income related to these patents?
- 25 A. Well, you know, we were trying to build value for

the venture capitalists; and, you know, it's good to build up regular recurring revenue as opposed to selling assets one time. That really doesn't build long-term value. If you keep selling off your buildings, you'll end up with no buildings. But if you have patents and you're licensing them and generating revenue every year from people's use of it, then that helps build up a recurring revenue stream which would, you know, help us

- 10 Q. Now let's look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 39, please,
 11 sir --
- MR. ALBRITTON: Actually before we move on, go back if you would, Mr. Seydewitz.
- 14 BY MR. ALBRITTON:

9

grow.

- 15 Q. If you would, Mr. Houh, look at page -- if you

 16 would look at the third page, down near the bottom. I

 17 don't have it marked on mine. I apologize. Okay.
- MR. ALBRITTON: It's actually page 1 of 4,
- 19 Mr. Seydewitz. It's Bates Number 004.
- 20 A. Yes. I'm here.
- 21 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- Q. Okay. Dr. Houh, if you would, look up from the
 bottom a little bit. Do you see two patents issued, one
 which is the '072 patent and one that is the '244 patent?
- 25 Do you see that?

- A. I do see that, yes.
- 2 Q. And those were specifically offered to license or
- 3| sell to Intel?
- 4 A. That's right. They were included in the list and
- 5 in the book.
- 6 Q. Now I'd like to direct your attention to
- 7 Number 39, please, sir.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 Q. What is this. Dr. Houh?
- 10 A. This is a letter we received from Intel a few
- 11| weeks later, addressed to my boss Alex; and it says that
- 12 they received them and they are going to -- they're
- 13 reviewing the matter.
- 14 Q. Thank you, sir.
- 15 Now if you would move to Plaintiff's Exhibit
- 16 149, please, sir.
- Do you see 149? I'm sorry. 149, please.
- 18 A. Okay.
- 19 Q. If you would, tell us what this is.
- 20 A. This is an e-mail that I received on January 17th
- 21 about two months after we sent it out.
- 22 Q. What does it indicate?
- 23 A. It says that -- it basically says "thanks but no
- 24 thanks"; and it was from Intel, a Brandon Antoni.
- 25 Q. Okay. And does it say anything about what Intel

had done?

2

11

- A. It said, "We have reviewed these patents, and are deciding to decline your offer."
- 4 Q. Thank you.
- Did BBN -- you talked about one of these
 licensing companies that you sent the RFP to. One of
 them was a company called Acacia. Did Acacia
 specifically negotiate with BBN concerning a number of
 patents including the patents that are in this case, the
 '072 patent and the '244 patent and then the related '102
- 12 A. Yes.

patent?

- 13 Q. When BBN was negotiating with Acacia concerning
- 14 those patents, what was the key feature of the proposed
- 15 deal from BBN's perspective?
- 16 A. We were looking for an ongoing share of any
- 17 ongoing licensing revenues.
- 18 Q. Did BBN, during the course of negotiations during
- 19 this time frame with other companies, ever have any
- 20 concerns expressed concerning BBN's prior ownership by
- 21 Verizon as it relates to these patents?
- 22 A. Yes, they did.
- 23 Q. If you would, tell the members of the jury about
- 24 that, please, sir.
- 25 A. So, because most or all of these patents -- almost

- 1 all probably -- were at one point owned by Verizon --
- 2 Verizon is a very, very big company and sometimes they
- 3 don't know what different parts of Verizon are doing and,
- 4 so, even though we believed there were no other existing
- 5 licenses to these patents that Verizon had granted
- 6 anybody, we couldn't be sure and we couldn't actually
- 7 confirm whether that was true or not with Verizon.
- 8 Q. So, was BBN able to promise to potential buyers
- 9 that there were no other licenses?
- 10 A. No. We actually could not represent that there
- 11 were no other existing licenses.
- 12 Q. Did that seem to have any impact on some of the
- 13 companies BBN was negotiating with?
- 14 A. Yes. I think it did have an impact.
- 15 Q. How so?
- 16 A. Well, they were very concerned that, you know, if
- 17 they bought or tried to license them, that they may be
- 18 licensed a lot and people they approached wouldn't need a
- 19 license because they had an existing one. So, that was a
- 20 risk; and it was a concern for some of these companies
- 21 eventually.
- 22 Q. Now, as it turns out, do you have any reason to
- 23 believe that there was a license between Verizon and
- 24 Intel?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. Did BBN ultimately sell the patents that are at
- 2 issue in this case -- the '072 patent, the '244 patent,
- 3 and the related '102 patent -- to a company?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And what company did it sell -- to what company
- 6 did BBN sell these patents?
- 7 A. It sold it to a company called "Stragent."
- 8 Q. Okay. Did BBN sell some other unrelated patents
- 9 also to Stragent?
- 10 A. Yes, it did.
- 11| Q. Who were you and Mr. Laats primarily dealing with
- 12 at Stragent?
- 13 A. We were dealing with a man named Kevin Zilka.
- 14 Q. And is Mr. Zilka seated here at counsel table?
- 15 A. Yes. That's Kevin.
- 16 Q. Up until recently have you seen him in a number of
- 17 years?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Mr. Houh -- or Dr. Houh -- excuse me -- did you
- 20 and Mr. Laats have many or few interactions or dealings
- 21 with Mr. Zilka?
- 22 A. Well, we had some e-mail exchanges, phone calls.
- 23 I did a lot of the legwork. Alex was involved at the
- 24 end, and we actually went to visit Mr. Zilka.
- 25 Q. Where did you visit with Mr. Zilka?

- A. California.
- 2 Q. Okay. If you would, turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit
- 3 149. Is this the --
- 4 MR. ALBRITTON: And turn to page 2, please,
- 5 Mr. Seydewitz.
- 6 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 7 Q. Is this the Patent Purchase Agreement between BBN
- 8 and Stragent?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Thank you.
- 11 In this Patent Purchase Agreement does it set
- 12 out how BBN was going to be compensated for the sale of
- 13 these patents?
- 14 MR. ALBRITTON: If you would, Mr. Seydewitz,
- 15 let's go to 13760.
- 16 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 17 Q. That's page 2 of the attachment, Dr. Houh.
- 18 A. Yes. I see it.
- 19 Q. Do you see something entitled "Payment"?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. All right. And then you've got an "Initial
- 22 Payment, 4.1. You've got an "Annual Minimum Payment,"
- 23 4.2.
- MR. ALBRITTON: And then if you would,
- 25 Mr. Seydewitz, go to the next page.

- BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 2 Q. And then you've got something called "Profit
- 3 share, correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Of those three components, what was most critical
- 6 to BBN?
- 7 A. Well, the most important thing was this profit
- 8 sharing percentage so that we could grow our annual
- 9 revenues.
- 10 Q. And what is the profit share percentage?
- 11 A. I'm looking for it in this particular section, but
- 12 I think it's 15 percent.
- 13 Q. Okay. 15 percent.
- 14 In addition to the profit share, was there any
- 15 other financial terms of this agreement between BBN and
- 16 Stragent?
- 17 A. Yes. There was an ongoing minimum every year.
- 18 Q. Okay. And anything else?
- 19 A. There was also an up-front payment.
- 20 Q. And how much was that up-front payment?
- 21 A. I think it was \$100,000 for this family.
- 22 Q. Now, did BBN believe that it was selling these
- 23 patents to Stragent merely for a hundred-thousand-dollar
- 24 payment?
- 25 A. No. It was the ongoing participation and

- licensing fees generated.
- 2 Q. At the time BBN sold these patents -- the '072,
- 3 the '244, and then the related '102 to Stragent -- did
- 4 BBN believe or know that Intel was infringing these
- 5 patents in any way?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. Had BBN undertaken any formal investigation or
- 8 study to determine whether or not any Intel products were
- 9 infringing these patents?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. Had anybody internal to BBN expressed their
- 12 suspicions about some Intel products?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury about
- 15 that.
- 16 A. So, the inventor, Walter Milliken, seemed to
- 17 believe that Intel was already infringing on the patent
- 18 when it issued.
- 19 Q. Did Mr. Milliken show you any specific information
- 20 or any detailed information that led you to believe,
- 21 Dr. Houh, that, in fact, Intel was using these patents?
- 22 A. No. He didn't have any detailed information.
- 23 Q. Now, in order to determine whether Intel is
- 24 actually -- or would have been actually infringing these
- 25 patents, what would you have had to have seen?

- 1 A. You know, I think in this particular case you
- 2 might have had to actually look at the circuitry or look
- 3 at some of the source code that generated the circuit and
- 4 the hardware.
- 5 Q. That information -- source code, for instance, or
- 6 detailed circuit drawings, are those things that are
- 7 publicly available?
- 8 A. No. Not to my knowledge, no.
- 9 Q. Dr. Houh, do you currently work for BBN?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. Do you have any sort of financial stake in any
- 12 recovery in this case?
- 13 A. No, I don't.
- 14 Q. Do you own any BBN stock?
- 15 A. No, or Raytheon. I don't own either.
- 16 Q. Okay. Do you actually -- do you own some stock
- 17 otherwise in your investment portfolio?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you own any Intel stock?
- 20 A. I do.
- 21 Q. So, if you ranked all the companies in which you
- 22 own stock from the largest -- that's the company you had
- 23 the most stock in -- where would Intel lie?
- 24 A. It's the second. Second largest investment.
- MR. ALBRITTON: Pass the witness.

MR. BURMAN: Your Honor, if we could approach

2 to pass out some new notebooks.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BURMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF HENRY HOUH

7 BY MR. BURMAN:

1

3

4

5

- 8 Q. Mr. Houh, I don't think we've met before. My name
- 9 is David Burman. Nice to meet you.
- 10 A. Nice to meet you, Mr. Burman.
- 11 Q. I've already botched a couple of names today; so,
- 12 if I botch yours, I'll apologize now.
- 13 A. It's okay. Everyone does.
- 14 Q. Thank you.
- 15 Now, you identify yourself on your Internet
- 16 LinkedIn business listing as an expert witness in
- 17 intellectual property litigations at various law firms,
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. Yes. That's one of the things that's on my
- 20 LinkedIn page.
- 21 Q. Actually that's the only thing that you put on to
- 22 describe your position after your name, correct?
- 23 A. I don't think so. I'm pretty sure that I had my
- 24 H3XL and Einstein's Workshop thing there, too.
- 25 Q. You mentioned the H3XL as current along with

- various law firms, correct?
- 2 A. Yes. That's something different than my expert
- 3 witness work, but that's where I spend most of my time
- 4 actually.
- 5 Q. And in the summary you don't describe that at all.
- 6 A. I thought that I did, but I -- sometimes LinkedIn
- 7 hides certain parts of profiles for people who aren't
- 8 paying.
- 9 Q. And you say in your summary that -- which you
- 10 updated this year, correct?
- 11 \mid A. \mid I don't recall when I last updated it, but I -- I
- 12 just don't recall when I last updated it.
- 13 Q. Well, you say for the position of "expert witness"
- 14 in intellectual property litigations at various law
- 15 firms, 2006 present (8 years)." So, I assume you
- 16 updated it in 2014.
- 17 A. Well, I think I put "present" unless I change it.
- 18 I wouldn't change -- no. Unless I stop it, I wouldn't
- 19 change it. It's always been present.
- 20 Q. Okay. But the eight years, you would have had to
- 21 change.
- 22 A. I think *LinkedIn* does that automatically because
- 23 it knows what today is and knows when my initial start
- 24 date was. So, I wouldn't have to change that, no.
- 25 Q. You describe yourself as a "trial tested lead

- 1 expert witness on major patent cases, two of which have
- 2 gone to trial," correct?
- 3 A. That's actually not -- that's not been updated.
- 4 I've been to trial a few more times now.
- 5 Q. Okay. And that you work for plaintiffs, correct?
- 6 A. Sir, I didn't hear that.
- 7 Q. It says you work for plaintiffs, correct?
- 8 A. I have worked for plaintiffs.
- 9 Q. Well, it doesn't say you work for anyone but
- 10 plaintiffs, does it?
- 11 \mid A. That's probably just an omission, but I work for
- 12 plaintiffs and defendants.
- 13 Q. And it says your areas of expertise include
- 14 networking, network processors, Internet protocol,
- 15 optical networking, telecommunications, voice-over-IP,
- 16 streaming media, telecom testing, all sorts of network
- 17 things, correct?
- 18 A. Yeah, if that's what it says. That sounds right.
- 19 Q. Okay. Now, you indicated that there were a
- 20 variety of buckets that you put these patents in and that
- 21 the last one was narrow patents; is that correct?
- 22 A. That was what was left over, but that was in one
- 23 of the buckets I described.
- 24 Q. Okay. And, in fact, it was more than narrow
- 25 patents. There were some cookie patents, weren't there?

- 1 A. I would have described some of them as kind of 2 "cookie" actually.
- Q. I mean, Verizon had an incentive program that caused people to apply for patents when they wouldn't really be quality patents, correct?
- 6 A. Well, Verizon did some evaluation on all of those,
 7 I assume; and they probably wouldn't have just filed it
 8 for, you know -- I don't know how they valued it, but I
 9 don't think they filed every single one that the
 10 inventors put in.
- 11 Q. Correct. But you found some when you got there
 12 that had been filed and continued and were not quality
 13 patents, correct?
- 14 A. Well, they saw a very narrow problem that we15 didn't think was a big market.
- 16 Q. Some were narrow, but some were also just bad.
- A. Cookie or bad or they solved a problem. I mean, inventors actually think about things and try to solve some problems and we had some very active patent files within BBN.
- Q. And one of the things that you looked at in deciding whether once you got in charge to continue a patent, that is to continue to pay the fees and to try to persuade the Patent Office to move forward, was whether there was some argument that somebody else was

infringing, correct?

- A. Well, I think we all made independent -- there
 were a number of people who kind of did that on their
 own; but it was really we looked at what the technology,
 what the patented claimed invention was and whether that
 was valuable.
- Q. And whether you thought someone might be sinfringing it.
- 9 A. I think for potentially -- you know, some people
 10 might have made some -- might have swayed that but we
 11 really looked at all of the patents and we really looked
 12 at what problem it was solving. You know, this is how I
 13 looked at it, if it was a big market and whether it was a
 14 problem we thought lots of people would want to solve in
 15 the future using our methods.
- 16 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Milliken, Walter Milliken, the
 17 inventor of the purported patents, he actually suggested,
 18 when you were going through this process, that maybe
 19 these were patents you should let die, didn't he?
- A. He -- well, I don't know what you mean by "let die," no. Certainly in terms of abandoning the patent that got issued, no, that's not what he suggested.
- Q. Well, he suggested not continuing to pay; and that would have caused it to be abandoned.
- 25 A. I think the issue there was that sometimes when

you receive a Notice of Allowance, that you can actually file a continuation which is a whole separate patent application itself; and I think he felt that because there was no value, because we weren't already out there trying to license it from Intel, that if we're not going to do that, then we shouldn't file a continuation. that wasn't the case actually. You know, he was very eager to get on with things; so, I think it's for a different set of reasons than what you are implying.

- 10 And you told him that "If we think we can 11 make a case against Intel, we should file a 12 continuation."
- 13 I may have said that in e-mail, but it was 14 really -- at the time he wrote that e-mail, we were still 15 trying to negotiate that encumbrance issue with Verizon.

16

17

- Q. And, in fact, you told him "If we're going to continue -- if we're going to continue to pursue this patent, we ought to write it so the claims more directly 18 19 read on network processors like the Intel processor," didn't you?
- 21 I don't recall saying that specifically, but it 22 may have been in the e-mail. But a continuation is a 23 whole new separate patent filing.
- And you wanted to try to cover Intel based on what 24 Q. he had found by looking at these Intel network 25

10

- processors, not anything involved in this case but the network processors. You wanted it written to cover network processing.
 - A. Well, in a continuation you can't actually change the patent specification. You can only rewrite different claims that are supported by the specification. So, if we maybe claimed it in a way that we could have claimed a little better and support it in the written specification of the patent itself, I think that would have been a good thing to do.
- 11 Q. And he told you not just that he had -- he thought
 12 the Intel network processors might be infringing but they
 13 were clearly infringing, correct?
- A. That's probably what he told me but based on my
 sexperience with this other case, a lot of work goes into
 the analysis for infringement and, you know, Walter
 wouldn't have shown me any of that.
- 18 Q. Well, he did show you some documentation he had
 19 found at the Intel network processors which he claimed
 20 suggested that they were using the same technology as the
 21 patent, correct?
- A. I think that was what he based his -- but I know
 what it would take, and showing a few diagrams
 wouldn't -- you know, that's not the right kind of
 analysis so...

- 1 Q. So, you would need source code and things that 2 aren't publicly available, correct?
- 3 A. Well, depending on what was claimed, but I think
- 4 in this particular case it was very hard to tell from
- 5 public information.
- Q. What was the source code and public information
 that Stragent had when they filed this lawsuit?
- 8 A. I don't know. I don't know what they had, but
- 9 I -- they probably didn't have it. They probably didn't
- 10 have the confidential information.
- 11 Q. Okay. I believe you're right.
- Now, if you could look at plaintiff's
- 13 exhibit -- that's in the notebook; they're marked with
- 14 blue so that you can tell the plaintiff's with the blue
- 15 "P" -- 155 if you would.
- 16 A. Okay.
- 17 Q. And this is an example of one of the RFPs; and
- 18 this one happened to be sent to IBM, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And if you go to the next page, Request For
- 21 Proposal November 19, 2007. That's actually the date of
- 22 what you sent to Intel, correct?
- 23 A. I think we put all of them in the mail on the same
- 24 day.
- 25 Q. Okay. And, you know, in the next four pages are

- the various subject matters of the patents, correct?
- 2 A. Yes. They're the groupings and a listing of each 3 of the patents in the RFP.
- 4 Q. And you mentioned that one of the groupings was
- 5 computing. Can you show me where the computing grouping
- 6 is?
- 7 A. Well, I guess I must have misremembered; but I
- 8 can -- it's enhanced displays, network security,
- 9 networks, other, physical sciences, speech and language
- 10 processing, wireless data networks.
- 11 Q. So, under networks there's about 20, 22 patents,
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. I don't know the exact number, but there's clearly
- 14 more than a dozen.
- 15 Q. And as Mr. Albritton pointed out, the two that are
- 16 involved here are near the bottom.
- 17 A. Of that page, yes.
- 18 Q. Correct. And there's a few more on the next page.
- 19 A. That's right. There's one more of the networks on
- 20 the next page.
- 21 Q. Okay. And they're not in alphabetical order, are
- 22 they?
- 23 A. The categories appear to be in alphabetical order.
- 24 Q. But the patents there, they're not in alphabetical
- 25 order. They're not in numeric order. They're not in the

patent number order.

- A. Yeah. There doesn't appear to be -- there are some high number patents and lower number patents and
- 4 they go up again; so, I don't know what order they're in.
- 5 Q. They probably were left in the quality order that
- 6 had been part of your original work in the months leading
- 7 up to that; isn't that right?
- 8 A. No. I don't think that would have been the case.
- 9 It may have been based on our internal docket numbers
- 10 which wouldn't have been meaningful to anybody else which
- 11| would have approximated time.
- 12 Q. Well, you did have a numerical system for rating
- 13 the quality or the value of the patents, didn't you?
- 14 A. We did an evaluation using numerical values.
- 15 Q. And you hid that field or deleted it when you sent
- 16 this spreadsheet out to potential buyers?
- 17 A. Oh, I don't think we deliberately hid it. It's
- 18 just that it was used to kind of figure out which ones
- 19 should be on this list.
- 20 Q. I didn't mean to suggest there was anything
- 21 nefarious about that. It's just you don't tell someone
- 22 that you're going to negotiate with what your hand is,
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. Yeah, sure.
- 25 Q. But you did tell some people, including Acacia,

- that you thought Intel infringed, didn't you? You told them that.
- A. I tried to use wording that we may have the belief. I try not to use the wording that they do.
- Q. And you were very careful not to hint to Intel
 that you thought Intel was infringing with its network
 processor buses, again not the products involved here but
 the products that Mr. Stark and other people may have --
- 9 A. Yeah. We were afraid that if we hinted that, that

 10 they could countersue us -- or sue us actually and then

 11 file a declaratory judgment and not be able to control
- Q. Because they would look at what they make, they would look at your patents, and they would feel

our litigation costs.

- honor-bound to do something about it, to say "We ought to get this resolved in a court of law and find out who is right and who is wrong," correct?
- 18 A. Oh, I don't know what the reasoning at Intel would 19 have been.
- Q. Okay. But you were afraid that would be their reasoning and that they would go to court and ask a court to resolve the issue.
- A. I think there's a -- you know, if you're sending out licensing letters, that's some reaction that some companies or maybe many companies might make actually;

- and, so, we were worried about that. We didn't want to have a lot of declaratory judgment lawsuits filed against
- 3 us.
- 4 Q. And actually the way -- the reason Intel was
- 5 mainly on the list was because it was a big company and
- 6 it might be interested in buying patents and, so, you
- 7 were sending this out to a lot of big companies.
- 8 A. Well, yes. But Intel did a lot of computer
- 9 networking.
- 10 Q. Well, actually it turned out that they had sold
- 11 their networking business a year before you sent the
- 12 letter; isn't that true?
- 13 A. I don't recall. I don't know. They were a big
- 14 company, but I thought they had a big networking division
- 15 as well.
- 16 Q. Now, why don't you look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 48.
- 17 That's actually the letter to Intel; so, you can look in
- 18 either notebook for that. And again it would be the blue
- 19 "P," 48.
- 20 A. Thank you. Yes, I see it.
- 21 Q. Okay. Now, the reason you gave categories was to
- 22 make it easy for the people receiving this letter to
- 23 determine whether they might have interest, whether it
- 24 related to what they should think about, correct?
- 25 A. That was part of the reason. If we bundled them

- all together in one big list, it would have been a lot of work to sort things like quantum cryptography.
- 3 Q. But you didn't mention microprocessors,
- 4 microprocessor design, servers. You didn't mention --
- 5 those weren't categories that you were offering them.
- 6 A. No. But they could have looked through the list 7 of four pages and read the titles.
- 8 Q. Well, you actually emphasized in the cover letter
- 9 and in the titles, the category titles, "networks,"
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. And you never suggested to them -- orally,
- 13 e-mail, letter -- that any patent on this list related to
- 14 the microprocessors or server processors.
- 15 A. No, we didn't.
- 16 Q. And you said it took them two months to respond.
- 17 Didn't you imply that?
- 18 A. It was about two months from the day we sent it
- 19 but I don't know when they started to review it, but it
- 20 took -- you know, the dates are on the letters.
- 21 Q. Okay. And didn't your letter invite them to
- 22 respond by the date they responded? If you go to the
- 23 next-to-the-last paragraph on Exhibit 48 --
- 24 A. Yes. I see it. It asks for a response by
- 25 January 18th.

- Q. And when did you get the response?
- 2 A. January 17th.
- 3 Q. So, there's nothing nefarious in the fact that
- 4 they did what you asked them to do unless you were
- 5 setting them up?
- 6 A. Oh, I didn't say there was anything nefarious
- 7 about that.

- 8 Q. Okay. Maybe Mr. Albritton suggested that, but I
- 9 apologize if it wasn't you.
- 10 And when you got their response, you just
- 11| moved on, correct? You didn't threaten them. You didn't
- 12 respond back to them. You didn't say, "What did you do
- 13 to look into this?"
- 14 A. No, we didn't follow up with Intel.
- 15 Q. And you never checked to see whether the Intel
- 16 network processors might be prior invalidating art or
- 17 technology that would invalidate Mr. Clark Milliken's
- 18 patents, did you?
- 19 A. Well, again we didn't do any analysis.
- 20 Q. Right. And you didn't expect Intel to take
- 21 150-whatever list of patents and try to go through every
- 22 one of their products and try to find out if somehow
- 23 there might be some correlation, did you?
- 24 A. Well, we told -- they had taken a serious look at
- 25 it.

- 1 Q. But you weren't going to take a serious look at 2 what Mr. Milliken had done to see if he might have been
- 3 using their prior art?
- 4 A. Well, what I meant was that they would have taken a serious look at what they might have been interested in.
- Q. From a business perspective they might have been sinterested in licenses.
- Now, you said some companies expressed some

 10 interest. Acacia, I think, was one. They're similar to

 11 Stragent, aren't they, Acacia?
- A. I think they may help -- they may have some
 similarities, but I think they also have a program that
 helps the owner license them.
- Q. But no one other than Stragent actually ended up deciding to buy even just a few of the patents on your long list: isn't that correct?
- 18 A. That's right.
- 19 Q. And it was for much less than you wanted.
- 20 A. Well, in terms of the percentage, we have a
- 21 starting point. We didn't think we would get the
- 22 starting point necessarily. It was a starting point for
- 23 negotiations. So, I don't think I would characterize it
- 24 as getting much less than we wanted.
- 25 Q. You didn't have multiple offers for these patents

- or for any of the patents on the list.
- 2 A. Well, not quite. I wouldn't characterize it as
- 3 that. We did have multiple offers expressed, but we
- 4 weren't able to close some of the other offers.
- 5 Q. And others at BBN, at least perhaps even
- 6 Mr. Stephen Milligan, would have preferred not to sell to
- 7 someone who would get value only by threatening and suing
- 8 like Stragent; isn't that true?
- 9 A. I don't know what Stephen thought.
- 10 Q. But there were people at BBN who didn't feel good
- 11 about -- if they weren't willing to stand up in court, as
- 12 you said they weren't -- getting 15 percent of what
- 13 someone would receive who would be willing to go to court
- 14 without looking at the source code and the like.
- 15 A. Well, I think that was -- it's risky. That was
- 16 the issue. You know, if a company like BBN spent a big
- 17 chunk of its profits on litigation, that wasn't exactly
- 18 the strategy that the senior management was looking to to
- 19 use for the business.
- 20 Q. Okay. Now if you could look at Defendant's
- 21 Exhibit 150 this time, and I think that is a red towards
- 22 the back half.
- Do you see that document, and do you remember
- 24 it from back in those days?
- 25 A. Yes. It does look familiar.

- 1 Q. Okay. And I apologize it's a little chunked up
- 2 because we had to take some pages out; so, it doesn't
- 3 flow quite. But if you could go to the second page of
- 4 the document, "Introduction to Stragent." Do you see
- 5 that?
- 6 A. I do, yes.
- 7 Q. And one of the things that they wanted to talk to
- 8 you about is the benefits of working with Stragent. Do
- 9 you see that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Bullet Number 46789?
- 12 A. I do.
- 13 Q. And then Bullet Number 6, "Stragent's Strategy
- 14 Going Forward," do you see that?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And if you would turn to -- I believe it's page 4
- 17 of what we have, page 19 of the document that you've
- 18 actually got called "Future Opportunities." "Stragent's
- 19 biggest value-add is its ability to identify value in
- 20 patents." Do you see that?
- 21 A. I do.
- 22 Q. And you understood that what that meant was that
- 23 Stragent would be creative. It would find ways to read
- 24 patents that you or Intel or other people hadn't
- 25 anticipated and to then make something out of that and

- try to get something paid to them; isn't that right?
- 2 A. Could you repeat that, please? I was just trying
- 3 to figure out --
- 4 Q. That was --
- 5 A. Okay.
- 6 Q. That was a terrible bunch of questions put
- 7 together, and I apologize.
- 8 But you knew what that meant is that they were
- 9 going to be creative, right?
- 10 A. I don't think that's -- I don't think it's about
- 11 creativity there.
- 12 Q. Well, how would they add value compared to other
- 13 people unless they could push and pull the words and push
- 14 and pull the various products and find a match that
- 15 hadn't occurred to other people?
- 16 A. I don't think it's necessary to do a push and
- 17| pull. I think it's -- you know, if you look in places
- 18 where the patents claim and you can see that there might
- 19 be some potential infringement, I think it's applying the
- 20 claims that were in the patent.
- 21 Q. But they stand out, they say, from what, you know,
- 22 people like you or Intel can do, correct?
- 23 A. Well, I mean, it simply says "identify value in
- 24 patents"; and we know that they did some work in
- 25 identifying patents that they were interested in.

- Q. I mean, they applied these patents outside of the network processing field to microprocessors and surprised everybody, correct?
- 4 A. Well, my understanding is that the claims --
- MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, I'm going to

 object. As the court knows, these claims are not limited

 to network processors; and he continues to suggest that.
- 8 The claims say nothing about network processors; and, so, 9 we would object.
- THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 BY MR. BURMAN:
- 12 Q. Mr. Houh, one other thing that they can do that
- 13 BBN wasn't able to do is to threaten litigation, correct?
- 14 A. BBN did not want to do that.
- 15 Q. And, in fact, sometimes just bringing litigation
- 16 is enough to extract settlements from companies that are
- 17 willing to pay to avoid defense costs, pay something just
- 18 to avoid the cost -- as you pointed out, the very
- 19 expensive cost of patent litigation, correct?
- 20 A. I wouldn't describe it with those words, but that
- 21 is sometimes what happens.
- 22 Q. Okay. And as you're -- you're aware that that
- 23 happened in this case with the companies Lattice and
- 24 Freescale, correct?
- 25 A. I don't know about those companies.

- 1 Q. They were willing to pay something to Stragent as
- 2 long as it was less than what it would cost to litigate
- 3 all the way to this stage, correct?
- 4 A. I don't know what those companies think.
- 5 Q. But what you do know is that Intel isn't willing,
- 6 correct?
- $7\mid\mathsf{A}.$ Up to this minute, I think that's true.
- 8 Q. Thank you.
- 9 THE COURT: Redirect?
- 10 MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 11 <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF HENRY HOUH</u>
- 12 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 13 Q. Let me ask you this, Dr. Houh. The processors
- 14 that are involved in this case, do you know that the
- 15 first one wasn't even sold until 2009?
- 16 A. I didn't know that.
- 17 Q. It would be hard to write patent claims in 2006
- 18 that cover a project or a product that doesn't come out
- 19 until three years later. Would you agree with that?
- 20 A. I'd generally agree, although a good inventor
- 21 tries to anticipate what's happening in the market.
- 22| Q. Mr. Burman asked you questions about Stragent's
- 23 decision and what they relied on to bring this case. Do
- 24 you have any knowledge about that at all?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. He asked you all these questions about being an
- 2 expert witness. Are you an expert witness in this case?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. Does that have anything to do with what you're
- 5 doing here today?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. Let's look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, please, sir.
- 8 MR. ALBRITTON: If you would, go to claim 12.
- 9 Your Honor, may I approach my table?
- 10 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 11 Q. If you look at claim 12 and claim 16, do either of
- 12 those claims -- those are the claims that are at issue in
- 13 this case, I'll represent to you. Do they say anything
- 14 about network processors?
- 15 A. No. It just says "a device."
- 16 Q. And the device can be many things other than a
- 17 network processor.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And the device of those two claims are described
- 20 by the actual limitations of those claims, correct?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. And do any of those limitations say anything about
- 23 network processors, of claims 12 and 16?
- 24 A. No, they don't.
- 25 MR. ALBRITTON: If you would, Mr. Seydewitz,

- 1 go to Column Number 2 under the "Detailed Description."
- 2 If you would, look at about line 56.
- 3 BY MR. ALBRITTON:
- 4 Q. Can you read that where it starts out with the
- 5 word "also"?
- 6 A. You want me to read that?
- 7| Q. Yes, sir.
- 8 A. Yeah. It says, "Also, the following detailed
- 9 description does not limit the invention. Instead, the
- 10 scope of the invention is defined by the appended claims
- 11 and equivalents."
- 12 Q. Then it goes on in the next line and talks about
- 13 one embodiment or one potential embodiment of the claims;
- 14 is that right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16| Q. So, these claims could cover network processors,
- 17| but they can also cover things like server processors so
- 18 long as all of the elements of the claim are met by the
- 19 products.
- 20 A. It's a device claim.
- 21 Q. Mr. Burman asked you about the ranking, the
- 22 numerical ranking of these patents; and he asked you, he
- 23 said were these listed in that RFP and -- in rank order.
- 24 Do you remember those questions?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Now, what was the scale?
- $2 \mid A$. We used a scale of 1 to 5.
- 3 Q. And what was the highest?
- $\mathsf{4}\mid\mathsf{A}$. 5 was the highest.
- 5 Q. Okay. And in order to get a 5, would each and
- 6 every person on the committee, after having reviewed the
- 7 patent and reviewed the patent claims, have to give it a
- 8 five?

- 9 A. Well, not only that, the chief scientist of that
- 10 division, the department head, and the inventor would
- 11 also participate in that ranking and would have also had
- 12 to give it a 5.
- 13 Q. This '072 patent that's at issue in this very
- 14 case, what was its ranking?
- 15 A. I think it was a 5.
- 16| MR. ALBRITTON: Pass the witness, your Honor.
- 17 THE COURT: Anything further?
- 18 MR. BURMAN: Nothing further, your Honor.
- 19 THE COURT: Okay. Is there any reason not to
- 20 excuse the witness?
- 21 MR. ALBRITTON: No, your Honor.
- 22 MR. BURMAN: No, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Houh, thank you. You
- 24 are excused.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Houh. I'm reminded that we have a procedure here where we allow the jury to ask questions, and I'd forgotten to do that in this case.

Would the jury please pass your forms.

Okay. The jury had no questions; so, you are excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Albritton, why don't you call your next witness.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor. We will call Dana Hayter, who is an Intel employee, via deposition. The total time, your Honor, is 21 minutes. Nineteen minutes to the plaintiff and two minutes to the

DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF DANA HAYTER

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the beginning of Videotape 1 in the deposition of Dana Hayter taken on behalf of plaintiff in the matter of *Stragent*, *LLC*, versus Intel Corporation, filed in United States District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, Civil Action Number 6:11cv421.

Q. Also, we're here under oath testifying just exactly as if you were in Tyler, Texas, testifying in

exactly as if you were in Tyler, Texas, testifying in front of a jury. Do you understand that?

25 A. Yes.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

defendant.

- $1 \mid Q$. And, so, you understand you're here to testify on
- 2 behalf of the corporation?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Are you a lawyer, Mr. Hayter?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So, you've been at Intel about nine years?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. What's your title?
- 9 A. Associate general counsel, technology licensing.
- 10 Q. Well, when Intel negotiates patent licenses, it
- 11 engages in dialogue with the other side and says, "You
- 12 know what? We don't use this invention. We don't
- 13 practice it. We do it in a different way, "right?
- 14 A. I'm trying to think back in the negotiations I'm
- 15 aware of, whether Intel has used that specific language
- 16 or representatives of Intel have used it. I certainly
- 17 haven't used language that way. As I said, the way I
- 18 think about this is infringe has -- is a legal conclusion
- 19 and let's talk about what the probabilities are and what
- 20 the right transactional approach to mitigating that
- 21 probability on either side might be.
- I can't definitively say no one from Intel in
- 23 a negotiation has ever used that language but in the
- 24 negotiations in which I've taken part, I have not used it
- 25 and I'm not aware of any specific instance where someone

has.

- Q. So, what is Intel's general corporate policy in performing patent searches prior to developing a new product?
- A. Well, as we've discussed, Intel respects other people's intellectual property; and if someone brings a patent to our attention, we look at it in good faith.

And I think, as I mentioned, there are literally millions of patents in the general technical art in which Intel conducts its activities; and there are tens of thousands of product features in Intel products. So, for that reason, it's simply impractical for Intel to ask a patent lawyer to go out and look at every one of the millions of patents that might relate to something Intel wants to incorporate into a product or change in a feature in a product every time it wants to do that.

- Q. And did Intel undertake any searches to determine if an Intel product implementing QPI with 8-bit or 16-bit rolling CRC functionality would infringe a third party's patent?
- I'm not asking about with respect to this lawsuit.
- A. With that qualification, I would say I'm not aware of any such patent search done.
- 25 Q. Let me ask you this: When did Intel first become

- 1 aware of Intel's patents -- I'm sorry -- Stragent's
- 2 patents; that is, the '072 patent and the '244 patent?
- 3 A. A company named BBN included them in a 75-ish-long
- 4 patent list with a letter asking if we wanted to buy
- 5 them.
- 6 Q. When was that?
- 7 A. 2000 -- sometime between 2007 and 2009. I forget
- 8 exactly when, though.
- 9 Q. I'm going to hand you what we're going to mark as
- 10 Exhibit Number 22; and that is a letter that came from
- 11 the files of Intel, correct?
- 12 A. It would appear so. It has the general counsel's
- 13 stamp on it in terms of it was received by his office.
- 14 Q. So, this was addressed to Bruce Sewell who at that
- 15 time was general counsel of Intel, correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And then it's stamped "Received, Bruce Sewell,
- 18 November" -- it looks like "26, 2007," correct?
- 19 A. Yes. I think that's the date.
- 20 Q. And then it's got a handwritten note on it. It
- 21 says, "Please see me, Dave." Do you see that?
- 22 A. I think that's what it says, yeah.
- 23 Q. And that's a note written by somebody at Intel.
- 24 That note wasn't written on this letter when it was sent
- 25 from BBN, correct?

- A. I don't know, but I think it's likely the case.
- 2 Q. Okay. Now, whose handwriting is that?
- 3 A. I don't know.
- 4 0. Who is Dave?
- 5 A. I'm -- I don't know for sure, but the chief patent
- 6 counsel's name is Dave Simon -- or was at the time Dave
- 7 Simon.
- 8 My interpretation of the note was Bruce was
- 9 writing a note, "Please see me, Dave," about the letter.
- 10 Q. Okay. So, that's likely a handwritten note from
- 11 Bruce Sewell to Dave Simon, the chief patent counsel?
- 12 A. That was my interpretation.
- 13 Q. This goes on and says that "the enclosed packet
- 14 summarizes the BBN patents that are open for
- 15 consideration." Do you see that?
- 16 A. I see that line in the letter, yes.
- 17 Q. It also asks for a letter of interest by January
- 18 the 18th. Do you see that?
- 19 A. I see the next line in the letter.
- 20 Q. Also in that third paragraph, it says, "We are
- 21 seeking proposals for the license or sale of certain
- 22 portions of our patent portfolios."
- 23 A. I see that line.
- 24 Q. And it also says, "Offers to license or purchase
- 25 may be for individual patents, one or more clusters of

- 1 patents, or our entire portfolio." Do you see that?
- 2 A. I see that line.
- 3 Q. There is an exhibit attached. It's -- the first
- 4 page says page 1 of 4, the second page in this
- 5 exhibit says page 3 of 4, and the third page in the
- 6 exhibit says page 4 of 4. Do you see that?
- 7 A. Yes, I do.
- 8 Q. What happened to page 2 of 4?
- 9 A. I don't know.
- 10 Q. On page 1, if you would count up --
- 11 A. I don't know if there was actually a page 2 in the
- 12 letter we got. I just don't know one way or the other.
- 13 Q. Okay. If you would count up four from the bottom,
- 14 it says --
- 15 A. Which page are we on?
- 16 Q. Page 1 of 4, which is Bates Number '004.
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 Q. Patent Number 7,028,244. Do you see that?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 Q. The inventor's name is Walter Milliken, correct?
- 21 A. It says first -- he's in a -- he's in a box with
- 22 the column heading that says "First Inventor."
- 23 Q. All right. And the one above that is 6,848,072.
- 24 Do you see that?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.

- 1 Q. And do you know those are the two asserted patents
- 2 in this case?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And you know that this other patent, this allowed
- 5 application that ends in '188 that's under the
- 6 '244 patent, that that was originally asserted in this
- 7 case as well?
- 8 A. Yes. No longer, is my understanding.
- 9 Q. When this went to Dave Simon, what did Dave Simon
- 10 do?
- 11 A. This is my understanding of what happened. At the
- 12 time Intel had a process referred to as "IP3." As you
- 13 can imagine, Intel gets lots of these kinds of letters,
- 14 tens a month. And, so, there is a group of people who
- 15 administer a process to evaluate them, including lawyers
- 16 and non-lawyers.
- 17 At the time it was run under the
- 18 supervision -- direct supervision of a lawyer named Brad
- 19 Greenwald; and he reported to the chief patent counsel,
- 20| David Simon. It was a program managed by -- in terms of
- 21 running the meetings and running the process -- by a
- 22 woman named Pam Hays. And one of the folks who reported
- 23 to her is named Brandon Antoni.
- 24 So, this went through the IP3 process. Every
- 25 week they would meet. They would look at any letters

they had like this. Brad Greenwald would have looked at them and headed the meeting, and they would decide which of the letters to give to patent lawyers to evaluate.

And then at subsequent meetings, they would check on the progress of the evaluation and ultimate legal advice and then take whatever next steps were indicated by that advice.

- 8 Q. So, in this case this patent came in. It went to 9 Dave Simon.
- 10 A. This letter came in.

4

5

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 11 Q. Yeah. I'm sorry. I misspoke. And then to whom 12 did it go?
- A. It went into the process. I don't know who he gave it to. I don't know if he gave it to -- next gave the letter to Brad. That would probably be his next step, but I don't -- in my interviews I wasn't able to determine that, you know, physical transfer.

process. It was assigned to a patent attorney named Larry Bennett. Larry Bennett remembers doing the analysis, remembers having -- doing some of the analysis over the holiday break and difficulties getting ahold of people to talk to with questions.

But what I do know is it went into the

- 24 Q. What sort of people? Non-lawyers?
- 25 A. Yeah. He might, you know, ask, you know, an

3

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

2.74

engineer for information about Intel's products so that he could provide legal advice to the company.

- Q. And, so, he was getting engineers involved to look at Intel's products with respect to these patents?
- 5 I know he got other people, and I wouldn't be Α. 6 surprised if some of the people he talked to were engineers. As I said, a patent attorney may ask for technical information from an engineer as part of information he uses to render legal advice to the 10 company.

You know, as I was saying, he remembers conducting the analysis. He remembers doing it over the holiday period. He doesn't have any memory of the substantive analysis. That was not something that was remarkable in his mind. And then subsequently Intel sent an e-mail out -- Brandon Antoni sent an e-mail out saying, in essence, "No, thanks. We don't want to buy a license to any of these patents," which was also part of the IP3 process, if that was -- if that was the ultimate decision.

- What about infringement? Did he make any Okav. 22 determination whether Intel's products or proposed future products would use these inventions, practice these inventions?
- 25 I would expect that that would be part of his Α.

- 1 analysis and he would be alert to provide advice to the
- 2 company and -- about any likelihood of -- the likely
- 3 consequence of patents being asserted against Intel. But
- 4 I don't know for a fact because he -- the lawyer that did
- 5 it just doesn't remember the substance of the analysis.
- 6 Q. So, he does not recall and Intel does not know
- 7 what his conclusion was with respect to infringement?
- 8 A. Or that he formed one. I would expect he would
- 9 have, but -- or risk of infringement, I should say. And
- 10 no, there is -- he just doesn't remember; and there are
- 11 no written records of the analysis.
- 12 Q. I'll hand you what we're going to mark as
- 13 Number 23. This is a letter from Bradley Greenwald and
- 14 Pamela Hays to Alex Laats, the president of BBN, dated
- 15 November 27th, 2007; is that right?
- 16 A. Well, the title for Alex is "President, BBN
- 17 Technologies, Delta Division." But otherwise, yeah, I
- 18 think that's right.
- 19 Q. And that letter is dated November the 27th?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And that's the date after Bruce Sewell received
- 22 the letter from BBN, correct?
- 23 A. It seems to be the indication of the stamp.
- 24 Q. How much time did -- and I've forgotten his name,
- 25 and I apologize. What was the name of the fellow who did

- the evaluation or the -- Larry Bennett.
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. How many hours did Larry Bennett spend on this
- 4 analysis?
- 5 A. You know, I didn't ask him specifically how many
- 6 hours. We talked in terms of the, you know, turnaround
- 7 over -- over, you know, less than two months. And he
- 8 indicated there was, you know, a significant amount of
- 9 work to get through that many patents in that period; but
- 10 he didn't tell me, you know, how many hours.
- 11 Q. How many other similar projects was he working on
- 12 at the same time?
- 13 A. I don't know.
- 14 Q. How many people did he speak to at Intel in doing
- 15 this analysis?
- 16 A. I don't know.
- 17 Q. Do you know the names of anybody he spoke to?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Did you ask him that?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. This wasn't the only thing he was working on at
- 22 that time, though, correct?
- 23 A. I'm not sure. My expectation is it would have
- 24 been a significant part of his assignments; but typically
- 25 people have, you know, more than one thing going on.

- 1 Q. Did Intel hire any outside expert to assist in 2 this analysis?
- ·
- 3 A. I don't think we hired any outside lawyers. I
- 4 didn't specifically ask about Intel's outside experts
- 5 that were non-lawyers.
- 6 Q. So, you don't know if they hired any sort of a
- 7 technical expert to assist in this evaluation?
- 8 A. I don't know for sure. I would be surprised if
- 9 they did, but I don't know for sure that they didn't.
- 10 Q. It's not typically the case that Intel does that?
- 11 A. In that time period it would be -- it would be
- 12 unusual to hire an outside expert on something that
- 13 resulted in a "no" answer and which I had never heard of.
- 14 Q. Intel did not enter into any sort of nondisclosure
- 15 agreement with BBN or seek any additional information
- 16 from BBN with respect to this matter?
- 17 A. I don't know.
- 18 Q. You don't have any reason to believe that they
- 19 did?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. I'll hand you what we're going to mark as
- 22 Number 24. It's an e-mail from Brandon Antoni --
- That's a gentleman you mentioned earlier?
- 24 A. Uh-huh.
- 25 Q. -- at Intel dated January 17th at 1:57 p.m. to a

- fellow at BBN. Do you see that?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And the subject line is "BBN's portfolio sale
- 4 offer to Intel." Do you see that?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And it's a letter from Brandon Antoni to Mr. Houh
- 7 and it says, "Thank you for your company's letter to
- 8 Bruce Sewell dated November the 19th, 2007, in which you
- 9 offered Intel the opportunity to purchase a patent
- 10 portfolio of over 200 patents." Do you see that?
- 11 A. I see that line, yes, in the e-mail.
- 12 Q. Okay. Back to our Exhibit Number 22, it says
- 13 actually that BBN would consider offers to license or
- 14 purchase for individual patents, one or more clusters of
- 15 patents, or the entire portfolio. Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yeah, I saw that text.
- 17 Q. But the letter sent back -- or the e-mail sent
- 18 back by Brandon Antoni only references an offer to
- 19 purchase a whole portfolio of over 200 patents. Do you
- 20 see that?
- 21 A. I see that line, yes.
- 22 Q. And it goes on to say, "We have reviewed these
- 23 patents and are deciding to decline your offer." See
- 24 that?
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- Q. And this was written by Brandon Antoni. It is not written by Mr. Bennett who actually did the purported analysis, correct?
- 4 A. I don't know what the adjective "purported" is supposed to mean in that context; but this e-mail is from 6 Brandon, not Larry Bennett. That's true.
- Q. And this e-mail doesn't say anything about Intel's reasons, correct?
- 9 A. It doesn't give a rationale for the decision.
- 10 Q. Well, it's got one sentence of substance -- "We
- 11 have reviewed these patents and are deciding to decline
- 12 your offer" -- correct?
- 13 A. I'm sorry. I don't know what "sentence of14 substance" means -- I mean -- means. The e-mail is here.
- We can read it. It's not inconsistent with other similar communications that Intel has issued.
- I would note that BBN nowhere in the letter,
- 18 at least the copy I have here, makes any allegation that
- 19 any Intel products would require a license. I don't
- 20 think there's anything remarkable about the e-mail.
- 21 Q. So, Intel did not believe that BBN was accusing it
- 22 of infringing any or all of those patents?
- 23 A. I think that's correct, yes.
- 24 Q. It offers no explanation whatsoever about why
- 25 Intel is declining the offer, correct?

- 1 A. It doesn't offer -- yeah. It doesn't give an
- 2 explanation. This is not inconsistent with other e-mails
- 3 declining to purchase patents.
- 4 Q. But we know that Mr. Antoni says that Intel has
- 5 reviewed all of the patents that are the subject of the
- 6 letter on November 19th, 2007, correct?
- 7 A. It says, "We have reviewed these patents."
- 8 Q. You read that to suggest that it's reviewed all of
- 9 the patents?
- 10 A. I think that's a reasonable interpretation.
- 11 Q. And that would, of course, include the patents on
- 12 page 1 of 4 which are the asserted patents in this case?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Did Mr. Antoni pick up the phone and call Henry
- 15 Houh or Mr. Houh or anybody associated at BBN?
- 16 A. I don't know.
- 17 Q. Did anybody at Intel contact BBN for additional
- 18 information about any of the patents in the table
- 19 attached to the November 19th, 2007, letter which is
- 20 Exhibit Number 22?
- 21 A. I don't know.
- 22 Q. Intel has got no knowledge of that?
- 23 A. I don't believe so.
- This is one of tens of such things we get
- 25 in -- we'd get in a month in that period.

```
281
              MR. ALBRITTON:
                               That concludes that offer,
1
2
   your Honor.
3
              THE COURT: All right.
                                       Thank you.
4
              How long is the direct examination for your
5
   next witness approximately?
6
              MR. ALBRITTON: Probably 30 minutes, your
   Honor.
8
              THE COURT: Well, why don't we try to conclude
   that and then adjourn for the day.
10
              MR. ALBRITTON: Okay. May I have one moment,
11
   your Honor?
              THE COURT: Yes.
12
13
              MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, the plaintiff
14
   calls Kevin Zilka.
15
              (The oath is administered.)
16
              MS. OLIN: And, your Honor, I'm Jaime Olin,
   attorney for the plaintiff. May I approach the court and
17
   the witness with binders?
18
19
              THE COURT: Yes.
20
              MS. OLIN: May it please the court?
21
               DIRECT EXAMINATION OF KEVIN ZILKA
22
               CALLED ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF
   BY MS. OLIN:
23
         Good afternoon, Mr. Zilka.
24
   Q.
         Good afternoon.
25
   Α.
```

- Q. Would you please introduce yourself to the jury?
- THE COURT: Could you identify yourself,
- 3 please?

- 4 MS. OLIN: Sure. Jaime Olin, attorney for the
- 5 plaintiff.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay.
- 7 BY MS. OLIN:
- 8 Q. Mr. Zilka, would you please introduce yourself to
- 9 the jury?
- 10 A. My name is Kevin Zilka.
- 11 Q. And please tell us a little bit about yourself.
- 12 A. I'm 39 years old. I'm happily married to my wife
- 13 Stephanie. We're going on our 12-year anniversary coming
- 14 up this May. I have four children, two twins, a
- 15 5-year-old boy, a 3-year-old boy; and actually my wife is
- 16 in the hospital right now and expecting our little girl
- 17 any day.
- 18 Q. Well, congratulations and thank you very much for
- 19 being with us this week.
- 20 Mr. Zilka, where did you grow up?
- 21 A. That's always been a hard question for me to
- 22 answer. I grew up in a military family; so, we moved
- 23 around from -- every other couple of years between state
- 24 by state.
- 25 Q. And you mentioned you grew up in a military

- family. Was it your father that was in the military?
- 2 A. Indeed. He was in Army Special Forces. He was a
- 3 Green Beret.
- 4 Q. Tell us a little about your education. Where did
- 5 you go to college?
- 6 A. I went to school at the University of South
- 7 Florida. I received a bachelor's, a master's in
- 8 electrical engineering. After that I received my law
- 9 degree at Santa Clara University in California.
- 10 Q. What kind of law do you practice?
- 11 A. I exclusively practice patent law. Basically I
- 12 help inventors get patents in the United States Patent
- 13 Office.
- 14 Q. So, you work with inventors. Are you also an
- 15 inventor yourself?
- 16 A. I am. I am a named inventor on 16-issued --
- 17 granted patents and 12 pending applications.
- 18 Q. So, tell us a little of the subject matter of some
- 19 of your patents.
- 20 A. Most of the inventions that I invent are based on
- 21 technology that I use on a day-by-day basis, whether it
- 22 be a cell phone or my vehicle, my car, or my computer,
- 23 whether it be a network browser or another application.
- 24 For example, one of my inventions is a -- it's a
- 25 technology to allow you to access your apps in your phone

more seamlessly while you're in a car, with the whole idea being it would be more safe to drive and still be able to access, whether it be your *Facebook* on your online radio station.

Q. Now, you work with inventors; and you're an inventor yourself. Has that led to any additional interests for you?

A. It has. My law firm partner and I started our firm after I graduated from law school about a decade ago. Since founding that, we built our staff up to about a couple dozen employees.

But as we started, it was around the time of the technology crash, often coined as "the dot-com bubble burst," I guess. And while we did have a lot of large clients that were able to manage paying their bills okay, we also had some smaller inventors who were struggling to pay their bills. We saw that, and we had an idea for those particular small inventors who weren't able to afford getting through the Patent Office. We decided to stop paying our -- or start charging for our fees up-front, and instead we would partner with them. In other words, we would not charge our fees up-front. We would invest our own time, our own expertise, and help them get their patent, with the idea that in the end our interests would be aligned and that they would have their

- patent and then we would share in any profits that they would get from their patent.
- 3 Q. Okay. And did you work on this through your law
- 4 firm, or did you form a separate company to work on this?
- 5 A. The company -- yeah. The company I'm referring to
- 6 was Stragent.
- 7 Q. When did you form Stragent?
- 8 A. I formed Stragent in 2007.
- 9 Q. And tell us where the name "Stragent" came from.
- 10 A. Stragent is something I came up with. It's a play
- 11 on words or amalgamation or combination of two words --
- 12 namely, "strategy" -- or "business strategy" and
- 13 "patents." And the patent is that it reflects what
- 14 Stragent does. It works with patents and it creates
- 15 business value from patents and that was -- I guess that
- 16 was how the idea came up.
- 17 Q. Now, Stragent partners with inventors. Does
- 18 Stragent also buy patents?
- 19 A. We do.
- 20 Q. And about how many patents has Stragent bought and
- 21 then licensed to other companies to use?
- 22 A. Over the years we've worked with dozens of
- 23 different patent holders or independent inventors, and I
- 24 would say the number is in the hundreds at this point.
- 25 Q. Are you the only owner of Stragent?

- 1 A. No. It's myself, a nice lady by the name of
 2 Leslie Novy, Alan Stuart, and Andrew Gordon, as well as
 3 Jason Player, who are with us here today, five of us.
- 4 Q. And all these other owners of Stragent live 5 locally?
- 6 A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Now, has Stragent ever done any other kinds of work that isn't related to patents?
- 9 A. Well, over the years we've done some IP

 10 consulting. At one point we had almost a hundred

 11 different clients in the local area. We were performing

 12 some IT services, meaning that we were building

 13 computers, purchasing computers, building networks,

 14 installing software.

In addition to that, we also did some internal research and development. At one point we had four engineers working on about half a dozen projects, meaning that they were inventing -- making inventions in-house and we were patenting them. I think today we have four pending applications that represent those efforts.

- 21 Q. Now going back to patents that Stragent has 22 bought, has Stragent bought some patents from BBN?
- 23 A. Yes, ma'am.

15

16

17

18

19

- 24 Q. Tell me a little about that.
- 25 A. In the year 2008 we got together with BBN, and we

- $oldsymbol{1}$ bought 11 patents from BBN. And after that -- there was
- $\mathsf{2}$ a string of two or three additional purchases after that.
- 3 Q. How many patents total has Stragent bought from
- 4 BBN?
- 5 A. Twenty.
- 6 Q. Now, going back to 2008, to that original purchase
- $7\mid$ of BBN patents by Stragent, who at BBN were you primarily
- 8 dealing with?
- 9 A. That would be Henry Houh, who we saw today, as
- 10 well as Alex Laats.
- 11 Q. Now, Mr. Zilka, I've handed you a notebook. If
- |12| you can turn in that notebook to the first three tabs,
- 13 which are PTX 1, 2, and 3.
- 14 A. I see them here.
- 15 Q. Great. What are these?
- 16| A. PTX 1 is the '072 patent that we heard about
- 17 today.
- 18 PTX 2 is the '244 patent that we again
- 19 referenced today.
- 20 And then PTX 3 is the '102 patent.
- 21 Q. Thank you, Mr. Zilka.
- 22 And are these three patents related to each
- 23 other?
- 24 A. They're what we would call a "patent family."
- 25| They share the same pictures or diagrams. They also

- 1 share the same description of the invention and those
- 2 diagrams. But they differ in the claims. The claims, of
- 3 course, are the most important of every application.
- 4 That's what defines the invention. The invention is
- 5 defined by the words in the claim and not the
- 6 specification or the other parts.
- 7 Q. Did Stragent buy these three patents from BBN?
- 8 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q. And are the '072 patent which was PTX 1 and the
- 10 '244 patent, PTX 2 -- are those the two patents that are
- 11 involved in this trial?
- 12 A. Yes. ma'am.
- 13 Q. So, now you see before you the next tab in this
- 14 binder is PTX 149. Can you tell us what that is?
- 15 A. This is a Patent Sale Agreement between Stragent
- 16 and BBN.
- 17 Q. And if you look at the page on the very bottom,
- 18 there are some numbers; and the numbers are 13771. If
- 19 you can turn to that page, please.
- 20 A. I'm there.
- 21| Q. And do you see on that page the '072, '244 and
- 22 related '102 patents are covered by this agreement?
- 23 A. I do see that.
- 24 Q. So, did this agreement that we see in PTX 149 --
- 25 did that actually give Stragent ownership of these

- patents?
- 2 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 3 Q. Now going back to this 2008 time frame, were
- 4 Stragent and BBN negotiating, going back and forth about
- 5 payment terms for these patents?
- 6 A. There were a lot of back and forth about it. It
- 7 started out on the phone and then as you heard today it
- 8 escalated to the point where they came to visit me
- 9 personally and then there were some additional phone
- 10 calls and e-mails, et cetera.
- 11 \mid Q. What did Stragent end up paying for the '072,
- 12 '244, and '102 patents?
- 13 A. Stragent bought these patents in exchange for a
- 14 promise to share 15 percent of gross proceeds of any
- 15 profits with BBN.
- 16 Q. Were there any additional payment terms?
- 17| A. There were. There was a one-time good faith
- 18 payment of \$100,000 as well as an annual minimum payment
- 19 of \$10,000.
- 20 Q. Now, Mr. Zilka, at the time Stragent was
- 21 negotiating with BBN, which of these components that
- 22 you've mentioned -- the profit share, that one-time
- 23 up-front payment, or that annual fee -- seemed most
- 24 important to BBN?
- 25 A. Definitely the profit share. Absolutely.

- 1 Q. Okay. And did BBN show any interest in that time
- 2 in just getting a one-time up-front payment for these
- 3 patents?
- 4 A. Absolutely not.
- 5 Q. Did Stragent's purchase of the '072, '244, and
- 6 '102 patents that we've been talking about -- did that
- 7 purchase include any foreign patents that are related to
- 8 those?
- 9 A. No. ma'am.
- 10 Q. And do you know whether there are any foreign
- 11 patents that are related to the '072, '244, and
- 12 '102 patents?
- 13 A. There are no foreign patents.
- 14 Q. Now, when Stragent, back in 2008, bought the '072
- 15 and '244 patents, did Stragent know that Intel was using
- 16 them in the Intel server processors that are the subject
- 17 of this trial?
- 18 A. Absolutely not.
- 19 Q. And, in fact, do you know whether those server
- 20 processors were even being sold by Intel at the time
- 21 Stragent bought the '072 patent and '244 patent?
- 22 A. They were not.
- 23 Q. Now, we've talked a little bit throughout the day
- 24 about this '102 patent that's related to the two patents
- 25 involved in this trial. Why isn't Stragent accusing

Intel of infringing the '102 patent?

- A. So, basically the '102 patent was part of this case originally. After the case began, we were allowed access -- I should not say "we." Dr. Stone, our expert, was allowed access to secret code that one could tell what the Intel processors were doing. And after looking at that code, it was determined that a particular element of the claim -- which by the way is not in these other claims that we've talked about today -- there was a switch limitation in these claims that Dr. Stone said Intel did not have in their product. So, as soon as we found out about that, we immediately dropped this
- 14 Q. Did Stragent do anything else with respect to 15 Intel and the '102 patent?

particular '102 patent from the case.

- A. We very promptly went to the court and made -
 17 basically told the court exactly what we found, and that

 18 is that Intel did not use the technology.
- Q. Now going back to the 2008 time frame again when Stragent purchased the '072, '244, and '102 patents.
- 21 What did Stragent do next?

13

A. So, the first thing we did, we rolled up our sleeves; and we tried to find out, okay, who is utilizing this technology, who is using it without permission. So, it took a couple of years; but we finally found two

- ompanies that did use the technology.
- 2 Q. Who were those companies?
- 3 A. The first company was a company by the name of
- 4 Freescale Semiconductor, and the second company was a
- 5 company by the name of Lattice Semiconductor.
- 6 Q. And what kinds of companies are Lattice and
- 7| Freescale?
- 8 A. These are chip manufacturers.
- 9 Q. What did Stragent do when it figured out that
- 10 Lattice and Freescale were using the '072, '244, and
- 11 '102 patents without permission?
- 12 A. We filed a case against those companies explaining
- 13 to the court that they were indeed using -- excuse me --
- 14 making products and selling products that utilized the
- 15 technology.
- 16 Q. And did Stragent eventually reach agreements with
- 17 Freescale and Lattice?
- 18 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 19 Q. Did those agreements include licenses for Lattice
- 20 and Freescale to use the patents?
- 21 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 22 Q. Now, you see in your binder you have PTX 50 and
- 23 51. They should be the next two exhibits.
- 24 A. I see those here.
- 25 Q. Okay. What is PTX 50?

- A. PTX 50 is an agreement between Stragent and
- 2 Lattice Semiconductor.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- $3 \mid Q$. And what is PTX 51?
- 4 A. PTX 51 is an agreement between Stragent and 5 Freescale Semiconductor.
- 6 Q. Okay. So, let's start with PTX 51. Tell us a 7 little about this agreement that Stragent reached with 8 Freescale.
 - A. Well, the first thing we did was we reached out to Freescale and requested some information. In particular we wanted to know how much money they made and how much money they expected to make by selling products using the BBN patents.
 - MR. JONES: Your Honor, we would object to this testimony for the reason that it is a fact that is being added to this agreement. It constitutes inadmissible parol evidence.

This agreement, the Freescale agreement, contains a merger provision that says all negotiations are merged into the agreement. Because of that, it's inadmissible parol evidence for them to try to put in additional information about the terms of the agreement from which they'll try to include other information. We object on that basis, your Honor.

THE COURT: What was the question again?

Could it be read back, please?

MS. OLIN: It was just generally asking about the agreement and his recollection of the terms of the agreement.

THE COURT: Well, for the moment, he's only testified about what's actually in the agreement. So,

MR. JONES: I think he started testifying about the negotiations and what he understood from what they were interested in.

THE COURT: Well, let's confine it for the moment to what's actually in the agreement; and if there is an attempt to go beyond that, we'll consider whether these are permissible.

MS. OLIN: Okay.

16 MR. JONES: Thank you, your Honor.

17 BY MS. OLIN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

- 18 Q. Mr. Zilka, let's take a look at page 4 of
- 19 Exhibit 51, Section 3.1 specifically.
- 20 A. I see it there.
- 21 Q. Okay. How much did Freescale pay Stragent based 22 on their past and then future use of --
- THE COURT: What do the blacking out represent

24 here?

25 MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, there were some

agreements among the parties about some necessary redactions; and those are the redactions that were agreed to by the parties and are subject to prior motions and orders before the court.

MR. JONES: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

7 BY MS. OLIN:

2

3

5

- 8 Q. Okay. So, Mr. Zilka, we're looking at Section 3.1 9 of the Freescale agreement. Can you tell us how much
- 10 Freescale paid for their past and future use of the
- 11 patents?
- 12 A. \$350,000.
- 13 Q. And was that a license for Freescale to use the
- 14 BBN patents forever?
- 15 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 16 Q. And generally how did Stragent -- how was that
- 17 350,000-dollar number -- who came up with that, and how
- 18 was that reached?
- MR. JONES: Your Honor, that's the information
- 20 that we would object to. Again, the negotiations of this
- 21 agreement by the merger clause are all merged into the
- 22 agreement. That's what the agreement says. Any
- 23 testimony about how these figures were derived outside of
- 24 that agreement is inadmissible parol evidence, and I
- 25 object on that basis.

- THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to sustain that.
- 2 MR. JONES: Thank you, your Honor.
- 3 BY MS. OLIN:

- 4 Q. Mr. Zilka, let's move on to Exhibit 50; so, go
- 5 back one tab. And you see that this is the agreement
- 6 between Lattice and Stragent?
- 7 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 8 Q. So, did Lattice also agree to pay Stragent for
- 9 using Stragent's patents?
- 10 A. They did.
- 11 Q. And if you turn again to page 4 of PTX 50, how
- 12 much did Lattice pay Stragent for using the BBN patents?
- 13 A. \$100,000.
- 14 Q. And was that a license for Stragent to use the BBN
- 15 patents forever?
- 16 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 17 Q. Okay. Why, then, was the Freescale license
- 18 \$350,000 while the Lattice license was \$100,000?
- 19 MR. JONES: Again, your Honor, we would have
- 20 the same objection.
- 21 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 22 BY MS. OLIN:
- 23 Q. Okay. Other than the '072 patent, '244 patent,
- 24 and '102 patent that we've been talking about, were any
- 25 other patents discovered by Stragent's agreements with

- Lattice and Freescale?
- 2 A. No, ma'am.
- 3 Q. And what about any foreign patents related to the
- 4 '072, '244, and '102 patents? Were any of those covered
- 5 by the Stragent agreements with Lattice and Freescale?
- 6 A. No, ma'am.
- 7 Q. Why not?
- 8 A. There weren't any.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Zilka, I want to move back to the
- 10 '102 patent for just a moment. And you mentioned that
- 11 after Stragent found out that Intel was not using the
- 12 '102 patent in the server processors that we've been
- 13| talking about, that Stragent dropped the '102 patent from
- 14 this lawsuit; and you also mentioned that Stragent made a
- 15 filing with the court regarding that. Do you recall what
- 16 that filing was?
- 17 A. In essence, it was basically a promise that the
- 18 issue was put to rest.
- 19 Q. And is that known as a "covenant not to sue"?
- 20 A. I believe so.
- 21 Q. Now, Mr. Zilka, how would you describe Stragent's
- 22 relationship with BBN?
- 23 A. I would consider it as a business partnership.
- 24 BBN has great technology, great patents; but what they
- 25 lack is the expertise, the experience, and sometimes the

- 1 resources to profit from those patents that represent
- 2 that technology. By joining with Stragent, BBN basically
- benefits from Stragent's expertise and experience so that
- 4 if there is profit from the patents, it is shared amongst
- 5 both companies, BBN and Stragent.
- 6 Q. And if this jury awards Stragent money in this
- 7 case, will that money be shared with BBN?
- 8 A. Absolutely.
- 9 Q. Now, earlier today did you hear Dr. Milligan
- 10 talking about some other unrelated patents, patents that
- 11 are in different families from the '072, '244, and
- 12 '102 patents, but patents that also came from the iRouter
- 13 project?
- 14 A. I do recall.
- 15 Q. Did Stragent buy those other iRouter patents, too?
- 16 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 17 Q. And has Stragent granted any licenses to other
- 18 companies to use those iRouter patents?
- 19 A. We have. We've granted licenses to two companies,
- 20 one company by the name of Huawei and the second company
- 21 is another company called "Accelerated."
- 22 Q. Okay. So, other than the '072, '244, and
- 23 '102 patents and these other iRouter patents, does
- 24 Stragent currently own any other BBN patents?
- 25 A. Yes. There were multiple other patent families

that I referenced earlier that we did purchase and we do $\ensuremath{\mathsf{own}}$.

- Q. Now, does Stragent add value to these patents that it owns?
- A. Yes, I believe so. For example, in the case of the patents we're talking about here, the '102 and the --7 excuse me, not the '102, the '244 and the '072, our big aha moment in this particular matter was unsurfacing, after years of trying to find evidence, a patent application, a patent application by the inventor das Sharma. I believe it's the same inventor that's going to speak in this trial.

This particular patent application -- there's two things important about it. Number 1, it came after the BBN patents, the '072 and the '244. And, Number 2, as an aside, it was continuously rejected in the Patent Office; and eventually the owner gave up on the particular application.

So, the point here is that by finding this evidence, this evidence, this rejected -- serially rejected application that came after BBN and our ability to connect the dots between this application and the Intel's server processors, we were able to find enough -- gather enough information to come together with our team and basically get in the door so that our experts

- could -- such as Dr. Stone could actually see the code and verify infringement.
- 3 Q. And if you'll turn back to your binder. Take a
- 4 look at the next several exhibits which are DTX 130,
- 5 PTX 105, PTX 106 and PTX 107. And these are 20 or 30
- 6 licenses between Stragent and other companies. If you'll
- 7 flip through those and tell us who some of the other
- 8 companies on these licenses are. To name a few, there's
- 9 Microsoft, AOL, Yahoo!, Google, Nokia; and I'm sure
- 10 there's a few others here as well.
- 11 And what do these licenses at DTX 130 and PTX
- 12 105 through 107 have in common with each other?
- 13 A. They give these particular companies the
- 14 permission to use the BBN patents.
- 15 Q. And do these licenses all include the '072, '244
- 16 and '102 patents?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Do they also include the other BBN patents aside
- 19 from the '072, '244 and '102 patents?
- 20 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 21 Q. And have these companies that are parties to these
- 22 licenses paid Stragent to use patents that Stragent
- 23 acquired from companies other than BBN?
- 24 A. These companies did pay for those licenses.
- 25 Q. And what about patents on which you're listed as

- an inventor? Do those licenses include rights to those companies to use those patents?
- A. These same companies also compensated me for my personal inventions as well.
- Q. Thank you, Mr. Zilka.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MS. BOSTWICK: Pass the witness.

THE COURT: All right. I think we'll adjourn for the day at this point unless there is an objection to that.

MR. ALBRITTON: No objection, your Honor.

MR. JONES: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Zilka, you have to return tomorrow for your cross-examination.

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. So, for the moment you're excused.

And I thank the jury for your attention.

18 We've gone a little past where we usually break, but

19 we'll break for today. And again I remind you not to

20 discuss your testimony -- not your testimony -- the court

21 proceedings with anyone outside of this room or even

22 among yourselves. You'll save that discussion for

23 deliberations later on.

So, the court is adjourned for the moment.

25 But we, as far as the lawyers are concerned, need to

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
return in ten minutes because there are a few items that
we have to address; and the jury need not be here for
that. So, thank you for your attention. I thought the
jury was very attentive today and I really appreciate
that and we'll see you tomorrow morning at 9:00.
           (Recess, 5:41 p.m. to 5:51 p.m.)
           (Open court, all parties present, jury not
present.)
          THE COURT:
                      There are a few items that I want
to bring up, and then I'll entertain anything that
counsel wants to raise.
           First of all, how are you planning to deal
with the admission of these exhibits?
           MR. ALBRITTON: Your Honor, we were just about
to offer those. We're going to offer all of the exhibits
on our First Amended Final Exhibit List, which was
attached to the First Amended Pretrial Order filed on the
9th, except for certain numbers. And what I would
propose is we would provide Ms. Ferguson in the morning
an updated list that has them physically marked as
"offered and admitted" to make --
           THE COURT:
                       Okay. Are any of the ones that
you're taking off the list those that have been
distributed so far?
           MR. ALBRITTON:
                           No, sir.
```

303 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 1 We'll handle 2 that in the morning, then. 3 Does Intel have any comment on that? 4 MR. CAMPBELL: That's an acceptable procedure 5 to us. 6 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then we have this motion to clarify. And, Mr. Albritton, tell me what it is that Dr. Vellturo would plan to testify to if I were to allow him to testify about the 42 percent. Where does that get you, in other words? 10 11 MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir. Ms. Bostwick is going to address that, if that pleases the court. 12 13 THE COURT: Sure. 14 MS. BOSTWICK: Thank you, your Honor. Melanie 15 Bostwick on behalf of Stragent. 16 And I'm sorry. I'll use the podium for the 17 court reporters. So, as our motion explained, the two elements 18 19 to Dr. Vellturo's analysis in this part of his opinion 20 goes to Factor 11 of the *Georgia-Pacific* factors. second part, which we understand the court has clearly 21 22 excluded, is about the apportionment of value between the 23 19 different RAS features in the bundle. understand that's excluded and will not offer that before 24

25

the jury.

2

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first element of his analysis is just taking the value of those 19 RAS features as a whole, the set of features that are colinear. They appear together in the accused Intel products. And that is his hedonic regression where he calculated, as explained in his report and the exhibits to that report, that those 19 features together account for I believe it is 42 percent of the value of the accused products; and that's --THE COURT: But where does that -- my question is where does that go? I mean, what does that prove? What's the relevance of the fact that 19 features, including one bundle that includes this, represent 52 percent of the value? Where does that testimony lead? Well, I think it speaks to the MR. JONES: value of, you know, the set of features that the accused feature is a part of; and then that would be relevant to the Georgia-Pacific analysis. Okay. Well, Mr. Campbell -- or THE COURT: does anybody want to --Could I respond, your Honor? MR. JONES: THE COURT: Sure. For the record, it's Mike Jones. MR. JONES: You know, your Honor, I think it only compounds the error. What we have here is an attempt at

apportionment. And what they have done is they've taken

the RAS standard bundle of features which includes, according to his calculations, 19 features -- I think it really includes more -- and he's then done an hedonic analysis on that and came up with an opinion on what portion of the price should be attributable to that.

THE COURT: I know what he's done.

MR. JONES: Okay. Excuse me. Well, then to the question of where do we go from here, Number 1, we're attempting to apportion but we've apportioned the wrong thing and I think that's ripe for jury confusion.

Number 2, once we've apportioned it, what does the jury do with it? They know that the RAS bundle is worth that, but there is no attempt whatsoever to narrow it in on the patented feature which should be our analysis. And this does not do that.

THE COURT: Okay. Any response to that?

MS. BOSTWICK: Yes, your Honor. I would just point out that Intel's expert Ms. Woodford has opined that the bundle as a whole, bundle of RAS features, has no value and that that is relevant to the calculation of the value of the patented feature; and, so, we would like Dr. Vellturo to be able to rely on his rebuttal to that.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. JONES: Excuse me, your Honor. I apologize.

Case 6:11-cv-00421-TBD-JDL Document 333 Filed 03/17/14 Page 306 of 366 PageID #: Jury Triggl Volume 1, March 10, 2014 306 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead. 1 2 The only thing I was going to say MR. JONES: 3 is as we offered in our reply, we are not presenting that evidence if his evidence doesn't come in. That was a 5 rebuttal. 6 THE COURT: Okay. On that basis I'm going to deny the motion to clarify, which means that Dr. Vellturo 8 cannot testify about the methodology by which he got the 9 42 percent figure. 0kay? 10 MS. BOSTWICK: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: And I'll issue an order about that at a later time. 12 13 Then we have the motion in limine concerning 14 new expert opinions by Stragent. Who is going to address 15 that one? 16 MS. BOSTWICK: That would be me, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Okav. So, I hope your Honor has had 18 MS. BOSTWICK: 19 time to review the motion papers. 20 THE COURT: I have. 21 MS. BOSTWICK: I apologize for filing it last But as your Honor is aware, this issue came up 22 23 because in the new proposed jury instructions that Intel

submitted last Friday, in the section on obviousness --

and you can actually see this because it's in the draft

24

final jury instructions that you issued earlier today -Intel is contending that certain prior art references
render claims 12 and 16 of the '072 patent obvious; and
these are opinions that are not disclosed in its expert
reports.

THE COURT: Were they covered by the invalidity contentions that were filed earlier?

MS. BOSTWICK: I believe there were general statements in the invalidity contentions; but as the cases cited in our motion make clear, the rule in this court -- I believe it's -- this court has held for the last 12 years that if it is not in the expert's report, that the expert is not allowed to offer that opinion at trial.

THE COURT: Okay. But the contention is it should be excluded because it's not in the expert report, not that it should be excluded because it wasn't in the invalidity contentions.

 ${\sf MS.}$ ${\sf BOSTWICK:}$ That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, I actually think that this is an issue for the charge conference and not a motion in limine. We don't plan to have the experts present analysis that their expert reports didn't provide notice about. It really is a question of what should the

jury be told about what our contentions are, and we think that that is more appropriately brought up in the context of the charge conference.

THE COURT: But I assume that you are planning to have expert testimony about claim 12 being obvious, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, only in the sense that if the claim is anticipated, it also is obvious. We don't plan to -- for example -- let me be very specific and clear about this. We don't plan to have a new combination of references that isn't disclosed in the expert reports --

THE COURT: Well, you're saying it's obvious over the same reference that you say anticipates, right?

 MR . CAMPBELL: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that for the moment at least with respect to claim 12, is not in the expert report, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: There is a passage in the supplemental expert report that talks generally about Dr. Stark's view that the claims are obvious in view of his work. There is also, with respect to claim 16, a more detailed analysis about how that claim is rendered obvious in view of some additional material that's again in part of his chips. He's not going to be doing

combinations of other references.

THE COURT: He's not bringing in any new references.

MR. CAMPBELL: That is correct.

THE COURT: But he is extending his discussion of the reference on which he relies to include obviousness as well as anticipation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Actually, I believe the answer to that question is "no" for the following reason.

Dr. Stark is also a fact witness that we disclosed long ago. He does plan to talk about how the chips that he built and designed are put together, and then there will be a portion of his testimony where we present expert analysis consistent with what's in his expert report.

So, we don't plan to go beyond, in the expert portion of his testimony, what's in his reports; but we do want to preserve the option of having the jury instructed with respect to claim 12 that Dr. Stark's work would either anticipate or render it obvious.

THE COURT: Well, I don't see that this is just a charge issue. It seems to me that your opposition to this motion said, well, it's true he didn't raise obviousness over this reference with respect to claim 12 but he raised it with respect to claim 16 so there is no prejudice, is what I had understood you to be arguing.

Fair enough?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. CAMPBELL: That is what we are arguing with respect to the charge that goes to the jury. We do not plan to have Dr. Stark get up and do an independent -- different analysis for claim 12 than the one that's in his report.

THE COURT: Well, isn't the analysis that he does in the report now directed to anticipation?

> MR. CAMPBELL: It is, your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: And what you plan to argue is that that same analysis would support a finding of obviousness, right?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, your Honor. That is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if he did this with respect to claim 16, what's the prejudice?

MS. BOSTWICK: Yes, your Honor. The prejudice is that we have no notice or disclosure of what his opinion would be as to the obviousness of one or more -frankly, we don't know -- elements of claim 12.

Dr. Stark offered an opinion that claim 16 is obvious in 22 light of either the Hydrogen Atom processor alone or the

23 Monsoon processor alone; but what he did was he said,

24 okay, all the elements of claim 16 that are part of

25 claim 12, those are anticipated. And then the additional

element of claim 16, the parallel decomposition, he said that's anticipated also. But if that one element is not anticipated, then it would have been obvious. And he provided, in paragraphs 51 and 62 of his supplemental expert report, an explanation that would support -- or that, you know, is offered to support an opinion of obviousness. He did not identify any part of claim 12 where he would say, you know, if this isn't actually present in the prior art, then it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill and here is why I think that.

So, we have no disclosure of the actual obviousness opinion; and this is exactly what this court rejected in the *SynQor* case that is cited at page 6 of our brief. You said you can't just as an expert say, you know, "This claim is anticipated by the prior art reference; but if it's not anticipated, it's obvious" and not provide any further analysis. That kind of opinion is excluded.

THE COURT: Well, let me tell you what my concern is, that we had this very late claim construction here which it seems to me to some extent changed the playing field here. The other claim constructions came before the expert reports. The experts didn't have the benefit of the claim constructions that I issued the

other day, and I'm not inclined to be too restrictive to the extent that they are addressing issues that are brought into play as a result of those new claim constructions.

Do you want to address that? Go ahead.

MS. BOSTWICK: I would like to address that if I may, your Honor. I have a few points.

The first is that when we went through this with them yesterday in the e-mail exchange that was attached as Exhibit A to our motion, they never argued that the reason that they were offering this new --trying to offer this new opinion on obviousness was as a result of your Honor's recent claim constructions. They said, "No, no. Look. It's in the report that he's already filed"; and they pointed to paragraphs 11 and 47 which we don't believe suffice as an opinion of obviousness.

The other point I would make is that while it is true that the court only recently adopted those claim constructions, the very supplemental report that they are pointing to that Dr. Stark submitted was submitted as part of this whole dispute over the courses of briefing where they said that Stragent's experts were applying these new claim constructions; and they submitted this supplemental expert report specifically to address those

alleged new constructions. So, they've already had an opportunity to submit his supplemental expert report in which they offer their opinions under this supposedly new understanding of the claims which in relevant part the court has now adopted.

And the other point I would just make, that, you know, Intel is not asking and has not asked for an opportunity to submit, you know, a supplemental expert report in light of the new claim constructions; and, so, we don't think that that is the -- a proper basis for allowing them to introduce these new opinions.

THE COURT: Mr. Campbell?

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, it's true we had a claim construction hearing last week and there were some constructions that the court adopted that neither party had ever proposed in the case. We understand that because the court has ordered that those constructions must be applied, that the experts need to apply them. So, the way in which the chip works and the way in which Dr. Stark has applied the analysis, we believe to be disclosed in the existing reports. We plan to present the evidence consistent with those disclosures. It is clear to me that Stragent and Intel have a disagreement about how those chips work and how they line up with the court's claim construction, but we do not plan to depart

from what we have described as the operation of those circuits. We believe that notwithstanding the court's claim construction, it still anticipates.

To the extent that we end up with a charge to the jury that includes obviousness, we think that that's appropriate. All of the evidence and analysis in terms of how the chip works has been disclosed. They've had an opportunity to depose Dr. Stark twice. We just don't think that there is really any prejudice here, and we think it fundamentally is a question of simply going with the positions that we've disclosed from the outset of the case that we do maintain that the Hydrogen chip and the Monsoon chip and the other prior art chips that we pointed to either anticipate or alone render these claims obvious.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mr. Campbell, it sounds to me as though you've got a decision to make; and that is whether you're going to ask Dr. Stark to testify to obviousness of claim 12 based on the Hydrogen and the other reference. And until we know what your decision is about that, I'm not going to rule on it because I don't need to. So, I think I'm going to postpone my ruling on this question until we see exactly what you're going to do.

I'm not sure it's just a charge conference

issue but why don't we postpone it and if there is going to be a dispute about what Dr. Stark testifies to, let's bring it up before he testifies so that I can rule on it in the context of something concrete. This is for the moment a bit amorphous, it seems to me.

MR. CAMPBELL: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay?

MS. BOSTWICK: Yes, your Honor. If I may raise one further point on this topic.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. BOSTWICK: As your Honor has discovered, the principal debate between the parties on this issue relates to the new opinion on claim 12's obviousness in light of Hydrogen and Monsoon. But there is also in the proposed jury instruction an opinion -- or a request for a jury charge that both claims 12 and 16 are obvious in light of the Hyannis processor alone and the Castine processor alone. And as we pointed out in our motion, these are also new opinions.

Dr. Bims, who is the expert who addressed those prior art references, did not opine that these claims 12 and 16 were obvious in light of those references alone. We put that in our motion. Intel didn't say anything in response to that part of our motion; and, so, we would ask that Intel not be allowed

to offer those opinions.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Campbell, what's your response to that?

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, we do not plan to offer an obviousness opinion with respect to anything that's not in Dr. Bims' report. Dr. Stark won't be testifying about the Hyannis. Dr. Bims did include information about obviousness. We don't plan to go beyond that. So, to the extent that they are concerned that there is something in the proposed jury instructions that strays beyond what the expert reports show, we don't plan to present that kind of evidence about Hyannis.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, again, I think this is in the amorphous category. We're going to be sitting down -- you have these draft instructions. We're going to be sitting down after court tomorrow to talk about them, and you can raise some issues about this. But you've got to decide what testimony you're going to present and tell the other side about it so that if there is a dispute about this I can resolve it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, one other thing that I want to raise is about claim 1 of the '244 patent. I had understood that there wasn't any claim for damages; and then when I saw the proposed final instructions, the

supplemental proposed final instructions, it does seem to me there is an issue about this. Is there an issue about whether there are damages sought with respect to claim 1 of the '244?

MR. ALBRITTON: Thank you, your Honor. Eric Albritton. Dr. Vellturo does not opine about specific damages with respect to '244; however, Ms. Woodford does. Ms. Woodford says that there is a single lump-sum payment of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$350,000 that would be the hypothetical license payment for both patents in the case which would necessarily include claim 1 of the '244 patent. So, Ms. Woodford herself opines that there are damages associated with a reasonable royalty properly associated with claim 1 of the '244.

THE COURT: So, that's all you're worried about is why is Ms. Woodford testifying about this if it's not an issue?

MR. CAMPBELL: She won't be offering that opinion, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So --

MR. ALBRITTON: Well, that -- your Honor, then we've got a real problem because in her report she does not segregate. She has one single damages opinion that relates to both patents; and, so, now all of a sudden, your Honor, I don't know how they can start changing her

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prejudicial?

```
Those were her opinions. She obviously issued
opinions.
her report after Dr. Vellturo. She chose and Intel chose
to issue those opinions in that way, and therefore that's
sort of their problem. They've made their bed, your
        They need to lie in it. And it would be horribly
prejudicial to us, having relied on what she did, to now
be in a position where they can change their opinions.
          THE COURT:
                      Okay. Mr. Campbell -- or
Mr. Jones?
          MR. CAMPBELL: I'm going to pass to Mr. Jones
who will be handling that examination.
          MR. JONES:
                      Your Honor, she had to assume in
order to do an opinion that the patents were valid and
infringed that were being asserted at that time and she
did assume that they were both valid and infringed and
they both have asserted it.
          Now that there is just one patent in the case,
she's not going to change her number. It obviously is
too high because of that.
          THE COURT:
                      She's going to say it shouldn't be
more than X or --
          MR. JONES:
                      Yes.
                             She says it should not be
more than $350,000.
          THE COURT:
                      Mr. Albritton, how is that
```

MR. ALBRITTON: Well, I guess I'm a little confused because there are two patents in the case. There were two patents in the case at the time she issued her report; and whether she had to assume or not, which certainly she did, she opined that the reasonable royalty was \$350,000 lump sum for both of them.

THE COURT: Well, how are you prejudiced if she takes out one of them and talks only about the '072 and says "I think the maximum royalty ought to be X for that" and she doesn't say anything about the '244? How is that prejudicial to you?

MR. ALBRITTON: It's prejudicial, your Honor, because I've relied on that fact and I can argue that Intel agrees that there are, in fact, damages associated with both patents. That's precisely what she opined. She was not required to opine to that. So, that is the prejudice to us, your Honor.

THE COURT: But you tell me that Dr. Vellturo isn't going to address the '244 patent.

MR. ALBRITTON: He's not assigning specific damages to it.

Your Honor, there is an undercurrent of an argument here that maybe is not -- the court doesn't fully appreciate, having gotten in sort of late; and that is one of the things that Ms. Woodford says, is that

there are only two patents here in this hypothetical negotiation as opposed to three patents that were at issue in the Freescale and Lattice case. If the court determines as a matter of law that there are no damages as to the '244, she very well may try to make some hay with this with respect to her damages opinions otherwise; and we were relying on her opinions that those were the appropriate damages as it related to both patents.

MR. JONES: Your Honor, we're not going to try to make any hay of anything. I mean, this is strictly a situation where -- you know, it's kind of to me the ultimate gotcha. You have an expert that has to assume the patents are valid and infringed. She's done that. She's come up with a lump-sum figure of not more than \$350,000; and she'll say that applies to the '072 patent.

THE COURT: Okay. I think there is nothing that I want to rule on right now. If Dr. Vellturo is not going do address the '244 patent, that's fine. That's not a problem. Nobody's objecting to that. And we'll see what happens when Ms. Woodford gets to her testimony about these license agreements and things like that, as to whether there is an objection to that.

MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, again, we'll postpone.

Let me see. I must say there is all this

testimony about monetization of these patents,

Mr. Albritton. It seems to me to be coming a bit close to having people who aren't experts testify that there was infringement with respect to these patents. I'm sure you don't intend that, right?

MR. ALBRITTON: No, sir. I think I can maybe address the court's concern a little bit more as it relates to Mr. Zilka.

So, as the court knows, the defendants filed a motion -- a Daubert motion twice with respect to the license agreements. What the -- of course Judge Love overruled that portion, as well did this court. We've got exhibits that are not objected to that are the licensing revenue provided by Freescale and -- I'm sorry -- the accused revenue provided by Freescale as well as the accused revenue provided by Lattice in those prior matters. That information was specifically relied upon by Dr. Vellturo to calculate the effective rate of those agreements. The court has said that that is permissible testimony. And we didn't do it as artfully as we should, and I apologize for that.

But the point is the defendants vehemently argue that it should be -- you should only look at the gross amount of the payment, not at the effective rate.

That's their fundamental point. The disagreement on the

parties is Intel's appropriate damages is limited to \$350,000 because that was the lump-sum payment or is it proper for the jury to award damages based on the effective rate. The court has already --

THE COURT: Computed rate, yeah. I've -- MR. ALBRITTON: You've already --

THE COURT: What I'm telling you, though, is I'm not sure how some of this testimony relates to that; and it sounds to me as though there is an implication here by Mr. Zilka and Mr. Houh that they've examined the patents, that they think they are infringed. And I just suggest that you be careful to avoid that implication because if you go much further I'm going to be concerned about it.

MR. ALBRITTON: Certainly that's fair. And I apologize. I know it's late in the day. But I have a very specific concern with respect to Mr. Zilka that is -- I hear you loud and clear on what you've just said. My concern, though, is, your Honor, the defendants say -- and the court has already rejected this whole point about lump sum versus effective rate. The testimony is clear and admissible, I would respectfully suggest, that Stragent in negotiating those licenses considered the extent of use, which of course is what *Lucent* tells us is appropriate. And, so, we're not trying to say -- and

we'll be much more careful. We're not trying to say that we believe Stragent -- you know, they're not offering opinions that Intel infringes. The purpose of that testimony is merely to say that when we negotiated a license with Lattice and Freescale, that we actually considered that -- the revenue information in reaching that decision. That directly contradicts -- and the experts talk about this. And, so, that's all we're trying to do, your Honor.

I'll be very careful as to the issue that you raised, but we ask that tomorrow Mr. Zilka be able to testify merely that in negotiating those licenses with Freescale and Lattice he considered their extent of use in terms of what was the revenue associated with past --

THE COURT: I've already ruled I'm not going to let him testify to what he thought that's beyond what's set forth in the agreement. But, you know, within those confines he can testify about this.

You understand my concern about not having these witnesses testify about infringement, that "we thought these were valuable patents because we knew they were infringed," so on and so forth. Okay?

MR. ALBRITTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And, then, is there anything else that we need to address this afternoon?

324 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm not aware of anything, your 1 2 Honor. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Albritton, how about you? 4 MR. ALBRITTON: No, sir. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all very much. 6 You've been cooperative. You've been very helpful to the We'll see you at 9:00 in the morning; and if there is something that you need to bring up before we bring the jury in in the morning, you know, I'll be here 10 a few minutes before we start so you can raise that. 11 So, for the moment, we're adjourned. Thank you. 12 (Proceedings adjourned, 6:20 p.m.) 13 COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION 14 I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THIS DATE, MARCH 10, 15 2014, THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS. 16 17 18 CHRISTINA L. BICKHAM, RMR-CRR 19 20 TONYA B. JACKSON, RPR-CRR 21 22 23 24 25

\$

\$10,000 [1] - 289:19

\$100,000 [5] - 134:3, 240:21, 289:18,

296:13, 296:18

\$210 [1] - 203:18

\$25 [1] - 109:20 **\$350** [1] - 137:18

\$350,000 [9] - 111:19, 134:3, 295:12, 296:18, 317:9, 318:23, 319:6, 320:15,

322:2

\$37 [1] - 106:12

\$53 [1] - 106:24

'004 [1] - 271:16

'072 [48] - 80:1, 80:12, 85:3, 87:16, 88:24, 99:25, 149:14, 150:23, 152:11, 153:18, 173:7, 173:14, 176:16, 188:23, 189:15, 192:17, 193:6, 193:9, 193:21, 206:16, 231:21, 234:24, 236:10, 238:2, 241:2, 265:13, 269:2, 287:16, 288:9, 288:21, 289:11, 290:5, 290:11, 290:14, 290:21, 291:20, 292:10, 296:23, 297:4, 298:11, 298:22, 299:7, 299:15, 300:15, 300:19, 307:3, 319:8, 320:15

'102 [31] - 150:19, 150:25, 192:17, 193:10, 231:22, 236:10, 238:3, 241:3, 287:20, 288:22, 289:12, 290:6, 290:12, 290:24, 291:1, 291:2, 291:13, 291:15, 291:20, 292:11, 296:24, 297:4, 297:10, 297:12, 297:13, 298:12, 298:23, 299:6, 299:7, 300:16, 300:19

'188 [1] - 272:5

'244 [48] - 8:22, 9:4, 9:7, 80:4, 80:13, 85:3, 87:16, 88:2, 150:10, 150:24, 152:11, 153:18, 192:17, 193:9, 231:22, 234:24, 236:10, 238:2, 241:3, 269:2, 272:6, 287:18, 288:10, 288:21, 289:12, 290:5, 290:11, 290:15, 290:21, 291:20, 292:10, 296:23, 297:4, 298:11, 298:22, 299:7, 299:15, 300:15, 300:19, 316:23, 317:4, 317:7, 317:12, 317:14, 319:10, 319:19, 320:5, 320:18

'98 [2] - 170:12, 171:10

'99 [1] - 147:22

1

/s [2] - 324:18, 324:20

0

0.01 [1] - 111:20 **004** [1] - 234:19

1

1 [63] - 4:5, 4:8, 4:10, 4:11, 4:14, 4:22, 4:23, 4:24, 5:2, 6:1, 8:21, 9:3, 9:23, 10:2, 14:25, 15:5, 19:12, 19:19, 41:21, 58:15, 68:12, 68:18, 69:10, 70:1, 71:7, 80:12, 85:3, 88:2, 100:13, 100:22, 101:13, 103:24, 105:12, 105:21, 111:23, 123:14, 149:11, 152:9, 153:24, 174:1, 175:1, 183:12, 220:6, 228:15, 230:7, 230:13, 234:18, 263:7, 265:2, 266:17, 271:4, 271:10, 271:16, 280:12, 287:13, 287:16, 288:9, 299:14, 305:8, 316:23, 317:3, 317:11, 317:14

1.18 [3] - 105:22, 112:1, 113:7

1.8 [2] - 106:11, 106:17

1.9 [1] - 106:18

10 [14] - 6:2, 17:13, 44:10, 48:22, 57:2, 58:9, 63:7, 69:11, 121:17, 142:17,

196:5, 196:16, 211:7, 324:14

10,000 [2] - 143:11, 223:4 **100** [2] - 211:21, 222:11

105 [4] - 5:10, 5:13, 300:5, 300:12

106 [3] - 5:10, 5:11, 300:5

107 [6] - 5:10, 5:11, 5:12, 5:13, 300:5, 300:12

10:24 [1] - 63:24

10:37 [1] - 63:24

10:42 [1] - 68:6

10:55 [1] - 68:6

10:59 [1] - 70:12

11 [9] - 17:21, 18:20, 24:7, 25:11, 69:3,

198:21, 287:1, 303:20, 312:15

112 [1] - 175:6

11:00 [2] - 63:17, 63:22

11:03 [1] - 72:11

12 [35] - 18:7, 58:11, 68:13, 68:18, 69:11, 70:1, 71:13, 80:11, 85:2, 87:21, 89:19, 124:14, 131:12, 138:24, 150:3, 150:4, 165:15, 211:1, 263:8, 263:11, 263:23, 283:17, 307:3, 307:12, 308:5, 308:17, 309:18, 309:23, 310:5, 310:20, 310:25, 311:7, 314:19, 315:16, 315:22

12's [1] - 315:13

12-year [1] - 282:13

12:41 [1] - 135:1

13 [5] - 68:13, 68:18, 69:11, 70:1, 71:15

130 [4] - 5:18, 5:19, 300:4, 300:11

13760 [1] - 239:15

13771 [1] - 288:18

14 [7] - 21:8, 23:13, 41:22, 58:1, 58:15, 69:11, 211:1

148 [2] - 4:3, 4:4

149 [11] - 4:5, 4:19, 4:20, 5:4, 5:5, 235:16, 235:17, 239:3, 288:14, 288:24 **15** [13] - 19:9, 58:21, 67:22, 69:11, 154:6, 154:10, 157:10, 162:5, 209:25,

240:12, 240:13, 258:12, 289:14 **150** [11] - 4:6, 4:7, 5:16, 5:17, 162:22,

150 [11] - 4:6, 4:7, 5:16, 5:17, 162:22 163:3, 163:4, 163:6, 211:22, 218:21,

258:21

150-whatever [1] - 256:21

1502 [1] - 194:10

152 [2] - 4:8, 4:9

153 [1] - 4:10

155 [1] - 250:15 **16** [35] - 19:16, 29:22, 32:14, 40:16, 41:19, 44:11, 52:3, 54:17, 58:3, 59:1, 59:10, 64:6, 67:2, 69:3, 80:11, 85:2,

87:21, 89:19, 99:6, 100:17, 149:24,

87:21, 89:19, 99:6, 100:17, 149:24, 150:5, 165:15, 196:5, 263:11, 263:23, 307:3, 308:22, 309:24, 310:16, 310:21,

310:24, 311:1, 315:16, 315:22

16-bit [21] - 94:24, 98:24, 99:2, 104:16, 104:23, 113:3, 115:1, 117:2, 126:24, 127:10, 128:1, 128:2, 128:8, 130:2, 130:9, 130:12, 130:17, 132:18, 133:17, 133:18, 268:18

16-issued [1] - 283:16

16-year-old [1] - 29:23

162 [1] - 5:16

17 [8] - 19:24, 58:21, 68:13, 68:18,

69:12, 70:1, 71:17, 210:25

171 [2] - 4:3, 148:5

172 [2] - 4:4, 148:19

17th [3] - 235:20, 256:2, 277:25

18 [7] - 20:6, 37:14, 68:13, 68:18,

69:12, 70:1, 71:19

18th [2] - 255:25, 270:18

19 [18] - 17:16, 33:19, 41:18, 55:8, 68:13, 68:19, 69:12, 70:1, 71:21,

104:23, 148:14, 250:21, 259:17, 303:23,

304:2, 304:6, 304:11, 305:2

1948 [1] - 137:12

1961 [2] - 117:10, 117:24

1970s [1] - 115:6

1971 [1] - 115:12

1977 [1] - 169:17

1978 [4] - 138:9, 144:12, 169:18,

170:10

1989 [1] - 212:8

1990 [1] - 212:10

1991 [1] - 143:15

1998 [2] - 170:10, 212:16

1999 [4] - 138:17, 144:24, 170:11,

171:10

19th [4] - 232:9, 278:8, 280:6, 280:19

1:40 [1] - 135:1

1:57 [1] - 277:25

2

2 [49] - 4:6, 4:9, 4:10, 4:12, 4:15, 4:23, 4:25, 5:3, 15:3, 15:11, 45:19, 68:12, 68:18, 69:10, 70:1, 71:9, 100:13, 100:22, 101:13, 103:24, 105:12, 105:25, 106:10, 111:23, 150:8, 152:9, 153:24, 173:7, 173:14, 174:1, 177:6, 188:24, 193:19, 193:21, 206:16, 206:17, 206:18, 230:7, 230:14, 239:4, 239:17, 264:1,

271:8, 271:11, 287:13, 287:18, 288:10, 299:15. 305:11 **20** [16] - 10:15, 21:9, 21:12, 29:8, 37:16, 37:17, 51:13, 56:8, 59:11, 69:2, 69:12, 134:14, 134:24, 209:25, 251:11, 300:5 20,000 [1] - 115:19 20-some [1] - 221:22 200 [6] - 211:20, 232:24, 233:2, 233:7, 278:10, 278:19 **2000** [19] - 95:1, 95:15, 99:15, 112:11, 146:22, 146:23, 146:24, 147:23, 148:14, 170:15, 171:13, 185:23, 186:13, 188:14, 189:19, 189:20, 189:24, 269:7 2000-2001 [1] - 128:11 2000s [1] - 126:14 2001 [8] - 99:20, 99:23, 117:3, 127:25, 190:23, 193:4, 193:6, 199:1 2001-2002 [1] - 159:5 2005 [2] - 89:2, 99:24 2006 [2] - 244:15, 262:17 2007 [13] - 112:16, 116:16, 116:18, 157:18, 232:9, 250:21, 269:7, 269:18, 275:15, 278:8, 280:6, 280:19, 285:8 **2008** [7] - 162:23, 162:25, 286:25, 287:6, 289:3, 290:14, 291:19 2009 [2] - 262:15, 269:7 **2010** [2] - 144:15, 170:16 2013 [1] - 95:13 2014 [3] - 6:2, 244:16, 324:15 203 [1] - 175:15 204 [1] - 175:22 21 [4] - 37:13, 58:22, 213:2, 266:12 **22** [7] - 21:20, 33:2, 174:11, 251:11, 269:10, 278:12, 280:20 23 [14] - 22:4, 32:8, 41:18, 44:11, 52:5, 56:12, 59:25, 64:24, 65:3, 65:9, 66:3, 66:20, 66:23, 275:13 **230** [5] - 4:11, 4:12, 4:13, 4:14, 4:15 **231** [1] - 4:16 234 [1] - 4:17 235 [2] - 4:18, 4:19 239 [1] - 4:20 24 [12] - 40:4, 40:6, 41:17, 54:22, 58:22, 60:22, 61:25, 62:14, 62:20, 64:6, 67:2, 277:22 25 [8] - 26:5, 40:15, 41:19, 54:9, 61:19, 64:6, 67:2, 118:7 254 [1] - 4:21 258 [1] - 5:17 25th [1] - 89:2 26 [7] - 23:8, 41:16, 44:12, 47:6, 64:7, 67:2, 269:18 **263** [1] - 4:22 27th [2] - 275:15, 275:19 **28** [3] - 149:1, 169:4, 180:10 287 [4] - 4:23, 4:24, 4:25, 5:1 **288** [4] - 5:2, 5:3, 5:4, 5:5 **292** [2] - 5:6, 5:7 **293** [1] - 5:8

296 [1] - 5:9

2:00 [2] - 134:15, 134:25 3 3 [47] - 4:7, 4:10, 4:13, 4:23, 5:1, 15:20, 37:10. 41:20. 45:20. 50:23. 64:21. 64:23, 65:3, 65:8, 65:9, 66:4, 66:5, 66:24, 66:25, 67:2, 69:3, 100:13, 100:22, 101:13, 103:24, 104:22, 107:22, 150:18, 153:24, 174:2, 177:9, 178:3, 179:8, 180:16, 181:19, 182:3, 182:14, 185:7, 207:15, 207:16, 208:24, 230:8, 271:5, 287:13, 287:20 3,000 [1] - 211:19 3-year-old [1] - 282:15 **3.1** [2] - 294:19, 295:8 3.5[1] - 106:1 30 [4] - 136:6, 169:3, 281:6, 300:5 300 [7] - 5:10, 5:11, 5:12, 5:13, 5:18, 5:19, 211:20 **301** [3] - 180:19, 181:13, 208:19 305 [1] - 122:6 305-308 [2] - 181:16, 182:10 308 [1] - 122:6 **32** [4] - 181:12, 190:7, 190:19, 196:5 32-bit [1] - 197:7 350,000-dollar [1] - 295:17 36 [2] - 138:9, 155:21 **37** [2] - 45:18, 45:19 **38** [1] - 182:9 39 [5] - 4:17, 4:18, 234:10, 235:7, 282:12 3:23 [1] - 210:2 3:42 [1] - 210:2 3Com [2] - 214:9, 214:10

4

4 [30] - 15:22, 16:3, 19:19, 68:16, 69:7,

69:10, 100:13, 100:23, 101:13, 103:24, 107:21, 117:22, 121:25, 174:2, 176:15, 178:23, 179:1, 179:9, 180:8, 234:18, 259:16, 271:4, 271:5, 271:6, 271:8, 271:16, 280:12, 294:18, 296:11 **4.1** [1] - 239:22 4.2 [1] - 239:23 42 [4] - 136:4, 303:9, 304:7, 306:9 **46** [1] - 211:3 46789 [1] - 259:11 **47** [1] - 312:15 48 [6] - 4:16, 4:21, 231:24, 254:16, 254:19, 255:23 4:00 [1] - 210:1

5

5[11] - 16:15, 24:15, 25:11, 69:3, 103:6, 174:2, 265:2, 265:4, 265:5, 265:12,

265:15 5-year-old [1] - 282:15 **50** [10] - 5:6, 5:7, 5:9, 117:7, 222:11, 292:22, 292:25, 293:1, 296:4, 296:11 **50-dollar** [1] - 98:14 **500** [2] - 117:12, 218:21 500-dollar [1] - 98:13 **51** [8] - 5:6, 5:8, 292:23, 293:3, 293:4, 293:6, 294:19, 311:4 **52** [1] - 304:13 **56** [1] - 264:2 **57** [2] - 106:8 **58** [1] - 169:2 5:30 [1] - 13:9 5:41 [1] - 302:6 5:51 [1] - 302:6

6

6 [14] - 15:22, 18:19, 24:19, 25:11, 69:3, 89:17, 149:18, 149:19, 174:2, 185:4, 193:12, 194:3, 259:13, 311:14 **6,848,072** [3] - 79:24, 171:16, 271:23 62 [2] - 177:9, 311:4 64 [2] - 190:7, 190:19 66 [1] - 136:1 6:11cv421 [1] - 266:21 **6:20** [1] - 324:12

7

7 [11] - 16:19, 41:22, 58:17, 58:18, 58:19, 68:13, 68:18, 69:10, 70:1, 71:11, 149:24 **7,028,244** [2] - 80:3, 271:18 **75-ish-long** [1] - 269:3 **750** [1] - 138:7 7th [1] - 193:5

8

8 [8] - 17:3, 41:20, 51:5, 69:10, 99:7, 130:6, 196:5, 244:15 8-bit [8] - 99:1, 130:3, 130:9, 130:18, 130:19, 130:22, 131:19, 268:18 8982 [2] - 200:5, 200:6 8985 [2] - 200:5, 200:8 8:52 [1] - 6:1 8:59 [1] - 11:8

9

9 [13] - 17:9, 37:10, 48:21, 52:13, 57:25, 59:13, 64:16, 64:17, 65:7, 67:2, 69:3, 199:17, 211:1 90 [4] - 62:5, 63:4, 112:2, 140:17 91 [1] - 24:16 99 [2] - 48:22, 62:22

9:00 [3] - 13:8, 302:5, 324:7 9:16 [1] - 11:8 9:39 [1] - 25:12 9th [1] - 302:18

Α

A&M [1] - 22:7 A-V-O-K-E [1] - 221:16 a.m [9] - 11:8, 25:12, 63:24, 68:6, 70:12, 72:11 A.M [1] - 6:1 **AAL** [1] - 124:7 abandoned [2] - 192:18, 247:24 abandoning [1] - 247:21 abandons [1] - 229:16 **ABC** [1] - 223:25 ability [8] - 84:4, 92:17, 94:23, 99:9, 132:22, 162:12, 259:19, 299:21 able [27] - 24:22, 29:1, 39:4, 49:9, 62:3, 73:15, 120:5, 121:3, 122:21, 129:22, 136:19, 173:11, 188:24, 209:1, 227:10, 227:12, 237:8, 253:11, 258:4, 261:13, 273:16, 284:3, 284:15, 284:18, 299:23, 305:22, 323:11 abroad [1] - 23:3 absolutely [4] - 289:25, 290:4, 290:18, 298:8 Abstract [1] - 89:7 **Abuse** [2] - 44:18, 44:22 Acacia [6] - 236:7, 236:13, 252:25, 257:10, 257:11 academic [1] - 169:11 Acasia [2] - 231:9, 231:18 Accelerated [1] - 298:21 accept [4] - 74:20, 90:25, 102:2, 144:7 acceptable [3] - 10:4, 10:5, 303:4 accepted [1] - 133:20 access [5] - 146:20, 283:25, 284:3, 291:4, 291:5 accomplish [1] - 115:24 according [2] - 176:5, 305:2 account [3] - 98:13, 128:22, 304:7 accounts [1] - 79:8 accurate [2] - 63:3, 174:8 accused [15] - 25:23, 30:17, 86:25, 87:4, 90:4, 90:5, 90:10, 103:13, 116:8, 130:11, 304:4, 304:8, 304:15, 321:15, 321:16 accuses [2] - 25:19, 73:20 accusing [2] - 279:21, 290:25 achievements [1] - 143:14 acquire [2] - 126:10, 215:2 acquired [3] - 126:13, 214:21, 300:23 acres [1] - 23:13 Acres [2] - 19:11, 34:1 acronym [1] - 195:15

Action [1] - 266:21

actions [2] - 105:6, 202:4

active [3] - 226:22, 227:10, 246:19 activities [3] - 30:2, 212:18, 268:10 activity [1] - 115:20 actor/director/producer [1] - 21:4 actual [11] - 33:22, 123:19, 147:23, 148:23, 158:1, 166:23, 172:9, 172:17, 222:13, 263:20, 311:12 add [7] - 13:23, 14:9, 106:21, 164:14, 259:19, 260:12, 299:3 added [5] - 100:14, 124:6, 228:18, 293:16 addition [3] - 75:10, 240:14, 286:15 additional [16] - 23:17, 64:20, 67:7, 125:3, 128:18, 191:2, 195:4, 277:15, 280:17, 284:6, 287:2, 289:9, 289:16, 293:22, 308:24, 310:25 address [12] - 64:2, 141:21, 302:2, 303:12, 306:14, 312:5, 312:6, 312:25, 319:19, 320:18, 321:7, 323:25 addressed [3] - 235:11, 269:14, 315:20 addresser [1] - 151:16 addressing [1] - 312:2 Adiletta [2] - 28:17, 125:5 Adiletta's [1] - 125:19 adjective [1] - 279:4 adjourn [5] - 67:17, 72:20, 134:24, 281:9, 301:7 adjourned [4] - 63:21, 301:24, 324:11, 324:12 admin [1] - 19:10 administer [2] - 72:12, 272:15 administered [4] - 72:14, 135:10, 210:10. 281:15 admissible [1] - 322:22 admission [2] - 107:19, 302:13 admit [4] - 41:8, 50:8, 107:13, 107:15 admitted [7] - 75:3, 75:4, 75:8, 75:17, 76:1, 302:21 admitting [1] - 50:4 adopted [4] - 112:7, 312:19, 313:5, 313:15 ads [1] - 21:5 adult [9] - 17:3, 18:12, 20:2, 20:18, 22:17, 23:1, 23:12, 136:4, 211:16 adults [3] - 15:15, 16:10, 21:2 advance [1] - 86:14 **Advanced** [1] - 140:3 advances [1] - 141:24 advantages [4] - 153:8, 153:17, 153:20 advertisements [1] - 55:12 advice [6] - 58:24, 273:6, 273:7, 274:2, 274:9, 275:1 aeronautical [1] - 136:14 affairs [1] - 14:1 affect [1] - 6:20 affected [1] - 85:23 affiliate [1] - 50:19 affirmatively [1] - 225:3 afford [1] - 284:19 Afghanistan [1] - 143:12

afraid [4] - 83:1, 160:7, 253:9, 253:20 AFRL [1] - 140:8 afternoon [6] - 113:12, 135:24, 209:22, 281:24, 281:25, 323:25 age [1] - 211:1 agencies [2] - 140:5, 140:7 agency [1] - 147:25 Agency [1] - 140:4 agent [1] - 16:14 ages [1] - 211:16 aggregated [1] - 182:16 aggregation [1] - 182:17 aging [1] - 144:15 ago [5] - 117:11, 144:14, 226:5, 284:10, 309:11 agree [41] - 25:6, 37:4, 37:8, 37:9, 37:11, 38:5, 38:17, 38:18, 38:21, 38:23, 38:25, 39:14, 39:15, 39:16, 39:17, 39:21, 39:25, 40:10, 40:16, 40:17, 42:18, 43:7, 43:8, 44:6, 44:7, 47:15, 55:22, 55:25, 64:15, 65:7, 94:6, 109:1, 156:18, 262:19, 262:20, 296:8 agreed [6] - 74:19, 105:24, 134:20, 203:11, 295:2 agreeing [1] - 192:4 Agreement [3] - 239:7, 239:11, 288:15 agreement [25] - 148:13, 203:14, 240:15, 277:15, 288:22, 288:24, 293:1, 293:4, 293:7, 293:16, 293:18, 293:20, 293:22, 294:3, 294:4, 294:6, 294:12, 295:9, 295:21, 295:22, 295:24, 296:5, 323:17 agreements [12] - 39:4, 104:25, 105:3, 147:19, 292:16, 292:19, 295:1, 296:25, 297:5, 320:21, 321:11, 321:19 agrees [9] - 38:1, 39:13, 41:1, 41:2, 44:2, 44:3, 47:11, 319:14 aha [2] - 202:11, 299:8 ahead [3] - 305:23, 306:1, 312:5 ahold [1] - 273:22 aid [1] - 81:2 Ainsworth [3] - 34:22, 34:23, 35:1 Air [1] - 140:8 air [1] - 16:9 air-conditioning [1] - 16:9 aircraft [1] - 51:22 Alan [1] - 286:2 **ALBRITTON** [136] - 6:12, 6:23, 7:4, 7:13, 7:22, 8:16, 9:1, 10:7, 10:12, 11:2, 25:4, 26:18, 27:25, 29:11, 31:11, 31:14, 31:16, 31:22, 31:24, 32:3, 32:7, 32:13, 33:5, 33:9, 33:11, 33:15, 33:18, 34:4, 34:8, 36:22, 37:17, 39:17, 39:24, 40:5, 40:9, 40:13, 40:20, 40:22, 41:16, 42:1, 42:5, 42:17, 42:20, 43:1, 43:9, 43:13, 43:16, 44:14, 64:8, 64:14, 64:19, 65:23, 66:3, 66:11, 66:23, 67:14, 67:19, 68:15, 68:20, 68:25, 69:8, 69:17, 69:20, 69:22, 69:24, 70:6, 72:1, 92:23, 93:2, 93:5, 93:12, 93:15, 93:19, 135:7, 135:12,

```
135:17, 135:21, 152:23, 153:5, 153:6,
153:12, 153:15, 154:17, 165:9, 165:12,
166:8, 168:9, 168:17, 168:25, 209:19,
209:23, 210:7, 210:11, 210:13, 210:18,
234:12, 234:14, 234:18, 234:21, 239:4,
239:6, 239:14, 239:16, 239:24, 240:1,
242:25, 261:5, 262:10, 262:12, 263:8,
263:10, 263:25, 264:3, 265:16, 265:21,
266:10, 281:1, 281:6, 281:10, 281:13,
294:25, 301:10, 302:14, 302:25, 303:11,
317:5, 317:21, 319:1, 319:12, 319:20,
320:23, 321:6, 322:6, 322:15, 323:23,
324.4
 Albritton [30] - 6:12, 7:16, 9:16, 26:17,
26:19, 27:20, 29:10, 29:19, 45:2, 45:6,
46:9, 50:16, 61:12, 64:13, 65:22, 92:21,
93:1, 93:18, 116:15, 135:6, 135:11,
210:5, 251:15, 256:8, 266:8, 303:7,
317:6, 318:24, 321:2, 324:3
 Aldine [1] - 22:25
 alert [2] - 143:7, 275:1
 Alex [14] - 214:3, 215:24, 216:3, 216:8,
217:12, 217:25, 218:1, 219:18, 222:7,
235:11, 238:23, 275:14, 275:16, 287:10
 algorithm [7] - 128:3, 129:16, 130:5,
130:17, 131:1, 178:4, 178:7
 aligned [1] - 284:25
 allegation [1] - 279:18
 allegations [1] - 133:21
 alleged [1] - 313:1
 alleges [1] - 87:20
 Allen [1] - 34:14
 Allison [1] - 16:14
 allocate [1] - 146:10
 allow [8] - 76:1, 76:3, 77:13, 125:10,
125:22, 266:2, 283:25, 303:9
 Allowance [1] - 248:1
 allowed [13] - 13:19, 37:2, 77:25, 78:8,
79:4, 81:24, 99:17, 223:17, 272:4,
291:3, 291:5, 307:13, 315:25
 allowing [1] - 313:11
 allows [1] - 83:13
 alluded [1] - 30:9
 almost [3] - 106:9, 236:25, 286:10
 Aloft [1] - 50:14
 alone [6] - 310:22, 310:23, 314:14,
315:17, 315:18, 315:23
 alphabetical [3] - 251:21, 251:23,
251:24
 alternative [1] - 112:7
 ALU [15] - 190:7, 190:11, 190:14,
194:11, 194:16, 194:25, 205:8, 205:10,
207:16, 207:17, 207:18, 207:19, 209:6,
209:8
 amalgamation [1] - 285:11
 amass [1] - 230:21
 Amended [2] - 302:16, 302:17
 American [1] - 12:4
 amorphous [2] - 315:5, 316:14
```

amount [9] - 40:24, 105:8, 134:2,

```
157:11, 174:6, 187:23, 190:13, 276:8,
321:24
 amounts [1] - 97:25
 Amy [1] - 19:16
 analogy [2] - 35:18, 36:3
 analysis [28] - 249:16, 249:25, 256:19,
273:21, 274:12, 274:14, 275:1, 275:5,
275:11, 276:4, 276:15, 277:2, 279:3,
303:19, 304:1, 304:17, 305:4, 305:15,
307:24, 308:23, 309:14, 310:5, 310:7,
310:11, 311:18, 313:20, 314:6
 Andralee [1] - 53:7
 Andrea [1] - 15:4
 Andrew [1] - 286:2
 animals [1] - 18:22
 Annie [2] - 16:7, 24:14
 anniversary [1] - 282:13
 Annual [1] - 239:22
 annual [3] - 240:8, 289:18, 289:23
 annually [1] - 221:20
 answer [9] - 14:20, 29:4, 62:19, 117:17,
159:22, 166:9, 277:13, 282:22, 309:8
 answers [1] - 172:21
 \boldsymbol{anticipate}~{\tiny [3]}-262{:}21,\,309{:}19,\,314{:}14
 anticipated [8] - 109:8, 259:25, 308:8,
310:25, 311:2, 311:3, 311:16, 311:17
 anticipates [2] - 308:14, 314:3
 anticipation [3] - 110:12, 309:7, 310:8
 Antoni [9] - 235:24, 272:23, 274:16,
277:22, 278:6, 278:18, 279:1, 280:4,
280:14
 anyway [1] - 55:4
 AOL [1] - 300:9
 Apollo [1] - 136:20
 apologize [22] - 7:4, 27:13, 43:13,
43:16, 58:19, 58:20, 68:16, 155:19,
158:25, 159:22, 162:18, 162:20, 234:17,
243:12, 256:9, 259:1, 260:7, 275:25,
305:25, 306:21, 321:21, 322:16
 Appeals [1] - 11:16
 appear [10] - 14:17, 80:15, 109:12,
200:5, 200:10, 213:3, 251:23, 252:2,
269:12, 304:3
 appeared [3] - 53:3, 53:10, 205:4
 appended [1] - 264:10
 applicant [3] - 85:18, 85:21, 85:25
 application [26] - 83:8, 83:10, 84:13,
84:14, 99:16, 99:17, 99:20, 119:5,
193:6, 194:1, 194:4, 194:6, 195:25,
197:12, 201:25, 248:3, 272:5, 283:23,
288:3, 299:10, 299:13, 299:18, 299:21,
299.22
 Application [1] - 193:25
 applications [6] - 57:17, 218:17,
218:25, 229:8, 283:17, 286:20
 applied [7] - 101:6, 159:14, 161:16,
196:12, 261:1, 313:18, 313:20
```

```
applying [2] - 260:19, 312:23
 appointed [1] - 138:16
 appointment [1] - 24:1
 apportion [1] - 305:9
 apportioned [2] - 305:9, 305:11
 apportionment [2] - 303:22, 304:25
 appreciate [17] - 12:3, 47:1, 47:8.
52:12. 54:7. 54:16. 61:23. 62:7. 62:16.
70:17, 71:1, 94:1, 94:4, 113:16, 210:21,
302:4, 319:24
 approach [10] - 77:17, 129:14, 135:14,
154:18, 210:9, 210:11, 243:1, 263:9,
267:20, 281:17
 approached [2] - 147:7, 237:18
 approaching [1] - 9:17
 appropriate [14] - 77:18, 82:2, 106:13,
113:2, 122:9, 122:10, 133:8, 176:4,
181:15, 181:24, 314:6, 320:8, 322:1,
322:25
 appropriately [1] - 308:2
 approval [1] - 173:22
 approve [1] - 173:23
 approving [1] - 157:17
 approximated [1] - 252:11
 apps [1] - 283:25
 architect [4] - 146:6, 146:7, 149:6,
215:19
 architected [1] - 170:21
 architects [1] - 146:5
 architecture [6] - 148:24, 171:11,
186:22, 189:22, 189:24, 191:18
 area [2] - 20:24, 286:11
 areas [4] - 8:13, 48:5, 232:20, 245:13
 argue [7] - 10:16, 48:3, 49:2, 87:1,
310:10, 319:13, 321:23
 argued [1] - 312:10
 arguing [5] - 10:20, 10:25, 35:11,
309:25, 310:2
 argument [2] - 246:25, 319:23
 arguments [4] - 73:5, 73:12, 74:23,
76:21
 Arithmetic [1] - 198:25
 arithmetic [1] - 194:19
 Army [4] - 21:3, 140:9, 222:19, 283:2
 ARPANET [3] - 95:10, 141:10, 232:18
 arrangement [2] - 203:8, 203:13
 arrives [1] - 164:20
 arrow [3] - 176:6, 176:9, 185:10
 arrows [1] - 185:12
 art [25] - 6:24, 85:7, 85:9, 85:14, 86:15,
108:24, 114:18, 117:25, 118:17, 123:20,
124:17, 142:19, 202:21, 208:12, 211:15,
256:16, 257:3, 268:10, 307:2, 311:9,
311:16, 314:13, 315:21
 artfully [1] - 321:20
 Arthur [1] - 20:5
 articles [1] - 53:22
 arts [2] - 19:21, 126:3
 ascertain [1] - 180:22
```

313:18

apply [5] - 90:25, 107:2, 110:16, 246:4,

applies [4] - 91:21, 96:19, 101:11,

320:15

aside [2] - 299:16, 300:18 aspect [2] - 59:18, 152:15 assembled [1] - 222:10 assembler [1] - 191:20 Assembly [1] - 137:14 assert [1] - 225:14 asserted [7] - 88:10, 272:1, 272:6, 275:3, 280:12, 318:14, 318:16 Asserted [1] - 80:8 assertion [1] - 225:17 asserts [4] - 73:25, 74:2, 87:7, 88:5 assets [2] - 219:1, 234:3 assigned [1] - 273:19 assignee [1] - 89:4 assigning [1] - 319:20 assignments [1] - 276:24 assist [2] - 277:1, 277:7 assistant [4] - 17:10, 19:10, 22:4, 22:15 assistants [2] - 34:18, 34:20 assisting [1] - 11:22 associate [1] - 267:9 associated [6] - 223:2, 280:15, 317:13, 317:14, 319:14, 323:14 assume [11] - 9:20, 46:17, 203:7, 204:19, 244:15, 246:7, 308:4, 318:12, 318:15, 319:4, 320:12 assuming [1] - 204:17 assured [1] - 79:13 astronautical [1] - 136:15 athletics [1] - 18:1 ATM [6] - 187:6, 195:10, 195:20, 195:22, 196:20, 196:22 Atom [1] - 310:22 attached [5] - 233:11, 271:3, 280:19, 302:17, 312:10 attachment [1] - 239:17 attempt [3] - 294:13, 304:24, 305:13 attempting [2] - 118:20, 305:9 attend [2] - 34:7, 144:15 attention [18] - 53:12, 77:10, 81:20, 109:4, 113:17, 134:10, 148:18, 152:8, 159:3, 177:5, 178:2, 180:8, 181:10, 194:9, 235:6, 268:7, 301:17, 302:3 attentive [1] - 302:4 attorney [7] - 18:13, 173:21, 174:17, 273:19, 274:7, 281:17, 282:4 attorneys [5] - 53:2, 53:9, 155:4, 202:17, 202:19 attributable [1] - 305:5 attribute [1] - 75:23 audience [1] - 14:22 audio [5] - 213:24, 223:11, 223:15, 223:16, 223:18 August [1] - 149:1 Austin [2] - 20:10, 22:9 Australia [1] - 23:3 author [1] - 103:5 automatic [1] - 65:25 automatically [3] - 130:20, 132:6,

244:22

160:19, 161:9, 188:22, 204:25, 209:5, 242:7, 250:2 avoid [4] - 134:6, 261:17, 261:18, 322:12 Avoke [2] - 221:12, 221:14 award [11] - 38:2, 67:9, 67:10, 88:14, 88:16, 143:21, 143:24, 144:1, 144:3, 144:8, 322:3 Award [1] - 143:16 awarded [8] - 88:12, 97:15, 115:18, 115:19, 143:16, 143:23, 144:4, 204:9 awards [3] - 143:13, 154:8, 298:6 aware [13] - 112:11, 130:13, 158:19, 159:8, 182:25, 198:4, 261:22, 267:15, 267:25, 268:23, 269:1, 306:22, 324:1 awhile [1] - 61:7 Azure [1] - 50:14

available [11] - 8:4, 77:1, 77:3, 115:8,

В baby [1] - 18:4 baby-sitting [1] - 18:4 bachelor's [4] - 169:14, 169:15, 169:16, 283:7 background [3] - 109:11, 169:10, 169:12 backpay [1] - 42:16 bad [8] - 36:24, 53:15, 53:18, 54:24, 58:18, 246:16, 246:17 baked [1] - 177:23 balanced [1] - 91:15 ball [3] - 16:16, 35:19, 36:4 BancorpSouth [1] - 98:3 bandwidth [1] - 197:18 bank [3] - 22:5, 98:3, 98:13 banking [2] - 98:4 Baptist [1] - 19:11 Barbara [2] - 22:22, 23:8 Barry [3] - 26:21, 53:5, 93:25 Base [1] - 213:15 base [1] - 108:4 based [17] - 29:2, 30:19, 40:25, 62:3, 69:1, 72:24, 74:6, 76:23, 79:14, 248:24, 249:14, 249:22, 252:9, 283:20, 294:21, 314:19, 322:3 basic [3] - 128:6, 194:16, 195:8 basis [7] - 9:6, 222:22, 283:21, 293:24, 295:25, 306:6, 313:10 Basis [3] - 109:17, 109:18, 126:9 bat [1] - 127:16 Bates [2] - 234:19, 271:16 BBN [214] - 50:18, 89:5, 94:11, 95:2, 95:6, 95:7, 95:16, 99:14, 99:16, 100:1, 100:3, 105:17, 105:19, 106:3, 107:1, 110:11, 111:9, 114:7, 116:16, 116:22, 126:14, 126:17, 137:4, 137:5, 137:6,

140:5. 140:11. 140:18. 140:23. 141:4. 141:15, 142:7, 142:9, 142:14, 142:25, 143:13, 144:11, 144:13, 144:19, 144:20, 144:23, 144:24, 145:7, 145:11, 145:21, 152:6, 154:1, 154:9, 154:11, 155:14, 155:16, 156:5, 156:7, 156:13, 156:19, 156:23, 157:3, 157:9, 157:14, 166:14, 167:11, 167:13, 167:15, 170:9, 170:13, 170:14, 170:15, 170:23, 171:3, 171:12, 185:23, 186:4, 186:13, 186:16, 188:7, 188:14, 192:20, 192:23, 204:21, 216:13, 216:14, 216:16, 216:19, 216:21, 217:1, 217:2, 217:3, 217:4, 217:9, 217:11, 217:13, 217:14, 217:21, 217:23, 217:24, 218:16, 220:1, 220:8, 221:19, 221:24, 222:23, 224:3, 224:7, 224:8, 224:21, 225:1, 225:5, 225:9, 226:18, 227:13, 227:19, 227:20, 229:7, 229:8, 229:13, 229:18, 230:17, 231:4, 232:16, 233:4, 233:23, 236:5, 236:8, 236:13, 236:18, 237:8, 237:13, 238:1, 238:6, 238:8, 239:7, 239:12, 240:6, 240:15, 240:22, 241:2, 241:4, 241:7, 241:11, 242:9, 242:14, 246:20, 258:5, 258:10, 258:16, 261:13, 261:14, 269:3, 269:25, 270:14, 275:14, 275:16, 275:22, 277:15, 277:16, 278:1, 278:13, 279:17, 279:21, 280:15, 280:17, 286:22, 286:25, 287:1, 287:4, 287:7, 288:7, 288:16, 289:4, 289:15, 289:21, 289:24, 290:1, 293:13, 295:14, 296:12, 296:14, 297:22, 297:24, 298:2, 298:5, 298:7, 298:24, 299:15, 299:21, 300:14, 300:18, 300:23 BBN's [13] - 95:11, 138:19, 140:13, 140:14, 141:11, 142:20, 186:10, 205:19, 223:9, 227:6, 236:15, 236:20, 278:3 **BBNT** [1] - 199:2 bears [2] - 91:18, 171:15 beautiful [1] - 37:1 became [1] - 215:18 become [3] - 223:19, 223:20, 268:25 **bed** [1] - 318:4 began [1] - 291:3 begin [13] - 11:7, 14:16, 14:25, 21:23, 72:15, 72:21, 115:5, 135:11, 148:11, 169:9, 169:23, 190:20, 191:12 beginning [3] - 170:16, 173:16, 266:16 begins [5] - 89:13, 89:17, 177:6, 181:13, 198:21 $\textbf{behalf}\, [17] - 6 : 13, \, 7 : 22, \, 11 : 2, \, 11 : 14, \,$ 27:11, 45:22, 45:23, 53:10, 67:19, 93:23, 93:24, 93:25, 113:14, 144:8, 266:18, 267:2, 303:15 **BEHALF** [3] - 135:20, 210:17, 281:22 behavior [1] - 191:24 behind [3] - 47:17, 178:19, 227:11 behold [2] - 100:5, 205:4 belief [2] - 91:25, 253:4 believes [2] - 39:12, 66:16

bench [1] - 14:4

Benefield [1] - 53:7

137:10, 137:12, 137:16, 137:17, 137:19,

138:11, 139:8, 139:17, 139:18, 139:23,

137:20, 138:2, 138:4, 138:6, 138:8,

Bob [1] - 116:25

board [3] - 106:21, 127:8, 158:21

benefit [2] - 128:17, 311:25 benefits [2] - 259:8, 298:3 Bennett [6] - 273:20, 276:1, 276:3, 279:2, 279:6 Beret [1] - 283:3 best [9] - 41:7, 58:7, 92:16, 113:18, 125:15, 146:10, 187:14, 217:18, 233:4 bets [3] - 108:16, 108:20, 111:13 better [6] - 66:9, 66:12, 97:7, 100:6, 118:7, 249:8 between [33] - 39:3, 85:21, 85:24, 97:19, 97:22, 104:25, 114:21, 125:10, 127:12, 129:23, 130:8, 132:25, 146:11, 151:17, 151:18, 158:21, 164:25, 167:11, 176:8, 217:17, 237:23, 239:7, 240:15, 269:7, 282:23, 288:15, 293:1, 293:4, 296:6, 299:22, 300:6, 303:22, 315:12 beyond [8] - 92:4, 117:18, 177:3, 294:13, 309:15, 316:9, 316:11, 323:16 bias [1] - 66:6 biblical [1] - 19:20 Bickham [1] - 11:25 **BICKHAM** [1] - 324:19 bid [1] - 139:19 big [21] - 97:23, 115:6, 115:9, 119:15, 123:4, 137:9, 214:24, 229:24, 230:21, 237:2, 246:15, 247:13, 254:5, 254:7, 254:13, 254:14, 255:1, 258:16, 299:7 bigger [2] - 129:6, 129:8 biggest [1] - 259:19 bill [1] - 204:4 Bill [2] - 17:2, 21:21 billing [2] - 203:19, 204:7 billion [5] - 106:1, 106:10, 113:8, 223:3, 225:10 billions [1] - 113:7 **bills** [2] - 284:15, 284:17 **Bims** [7] - 28:18, 107:9, 107:10, 107:25, 108:22, 315:20, 316:7 Bims' [1] - 316:6 binder [6] - 110:8, 149:10, 230:6, 288:14, 292:22, 300:3 binders [1] - 281:18 biologic [1] - 177:20 bit [38] - 13:10, 33:25, 68:15, 79:1, 82:20, 83:3, 88:24, 91:2, 99:6, 108:17, 113:24, 114:1, 118:25, 119:13, 121:8, 123:3, 123:5, 127:24, 128:10, 137:10, 137:20, 139:17, 163:20, 169:10, 170:13, 170:17, 205:18, 210:23, 218:8, 220:24, 222:3, 234:23, 282:11, 290:23, 315:5, 321:2, 321:7 bits [3] - 130:6, 187:22, 190:7 blacking [1] - 294:23

Blackjack [1] - 212:22

Blanton [2] - 12:1, 71:5

blue [4] - 163:2, 250:14, 254:18

Block [1] - 20:16

block [1] - 197:18

bomb [1] - 55:4 book [13] - 54:13, 85:2, 95:7, 103:5, 103:8, 141:13, 162:21, 212:18, 212:24, 212:25, 228:18, 235:5 booklet [2] - 228:13 books [2] - 90:21, 141:11 boom [2] - 144:22 boomerang [1] - 222:6 Boomerang [6] - 143:9, 222:2, 222:16, 222:20, 222:25, 223:1 Boomerangs [1] - 223:4 boss [5] - 186:8, 186:10, 215:24, 219:18, 235:11 Boston [2] - 136:7, 211:7 Bostwick [3] - 53:8, 303:11, 303:15 BOSTWICK [13] - 301:6, 303:14, 305:17, 306:10, 306:16, 306:18, 306:21, 307:8, 307:19, 310:17, 312:6, 315:8, 315:11 botch [1] - 243:12 botched [1] - 243:11 bothers [1] - 14:5 bottom [10] - 111:5, 176:6, 176:24, 178:2, 179:8, 234:16, 234:23, 251:16, 271:13, 288:17 bought [16] - 32:16, 37:24, 37:25, 38:3, 54:3, 54:5, 55:12, 237:17, 285:20, 286:22, 287:1, 287:3, 289:13, 290:14, 290:21 bound [3] - 110:16, 228:18, 253:15 boundaries [5] - 48:11, 48:12, 86:9, 86:10, 90:1 boutique [1] - 22:10 **box** [17] - 71:5, 71:8, 71:10, 71:12, 71:14, 71:16, 71:18, 71:20, 71:22, 175:6, 185:12, 188:4, 188:6, 204:25, 205:2, 208:19, 271:21 boxes [1] - 111:7 boy [5] - 17:15, 29:25, 211:1, 282:15 boys [3] - 21:12, 21:15 Brad [6] - 28:17, 125:5, 125:19, 272:18, 273:1, 273:15 Bradley [1] - 275:13 **brains** [2] - 96:11, 96:12 branch [4] - 31:18, 37:10, 41:20, 50:24 Branch [2] - 15:20, 15:21 brand [1] - 19:25 Brandon [8] - 235:24, 272:23, 274:16, 277:22, 278:6, 278:18, 279:1, 279:6 break [15] - 29:9, 63:16, 63:19, 64:4, 68:2, 78:24, 94:3, 109:25, 134:14, 187:15, 209:22, 209:24, 273:22, 301:18, 301:19 breaking [1] - 219:11 brief [7] - 25:25, 72:16, 87:14, 89:8, 89:9, 186:9, 311:15 blocks [4] - 181:7, 183:25, 208:3, 209:2 briefing [1] - 312:22 briefly [3] - 25:14, 76:11, 79:22

brightest [1] - 95:4 bring [16] - 6:7, 10:11, 11:6, 35:3, 49:21, 70:10, 78:22, 79:2, 79:13, 122:24, 159:3, 262:23, 302:10, 315:3, 324:8, 324:9 Bringing [1] - 213:1 **bringing** [3] - 114:3, 261:15, 309:2 brings [2] - 47:9, 268:6 broaden [1] - 36:17 broader [2] - 33:25, 78:4 broadly [1] - 32:22 broke [1] - 219:23 **brother** [4] - 26:6, 32:19, 54:11, 61:20 brought [6] - 13:1, 25:17, 33:13, 127:5, 308:2, 312:3 browser [1] - 283:23 Bruce [7] - 232:10, 269:14, 269:17, 270:8, 270:11, 275:21, 278:8 Bryan [2] - 15:19, 23:10 Bryan/College [1] - 18:13 bubble [1] - 284:13 Bucket [1] - 220:5 bucket [7] - 220:7, 220:12, 220:14, 222:24, 223:5, 227:21, 233:3 buckets [3] - 220:3, 245:20, 245:23 budget [1] - 219:4 Bufe [2] - 34:12, 34:14 build [18] - 122:12, 139:20, 141:5, 142:12, 142:15, 143:6, 186:21, 186:24, 187:24, 188:3, 188:9, 193:8, 200:22, 223:16, 233:25, 234:2, 234:3, 234:7 building [4] - 141:24, 170:7, 286:12, 286:13 buildings [2] - 234:4, 234:5 **built** [17] - 114:14, 125:4, 141:21, 151:24, 156:4, 164:8, 192:6, 192:15, 192:20, 201:15, 213:15, 217:16, 221:4, 232:18, 233:7, 284:10, 309:12 bulk [1] - 211:9 bullet [1] - 259:11 Bullet [1] - 259:13 bullets [2] - 139:6, 143:5 Bumgardner [3] - 26:21, 53:5, 94:1 bunch [4] - 122:19, 157:20, 224:1, 260:6 bundle [6] - 303:23, 304:12, 305:1, 305:12, 305:19 bundled [1] - 254:25 Bunt [3] - 34:22, 34:23, 34:25 burden [13] - 24:19, 35:24, 36:6, 36:8, 91:3, 91:4, 91:10, 91:18, 91:23, 92:5, 102.1 burdens [1] - 91:7 Burger [1] - 17:17 **BURMAN** [15] - 152:20, 153:2, 153:10, 154:18, 154:22, 155:2, 166:6, 168:11, 168:19, 243:1, 243:4, 243:7, 261:11, 265:18, 265:22 Burman [10] - 27:11, 154:22, 155:3, 165:13, 166:12, 167:1, 243:9, 243:10,

```
262:22, 264:21
                                               capture [1] - 171:6
 Burres [2] - 28:17, 125:6
 Burres' [1] - 125:19
 burst [1] - 284:14
 bus [3] - 209:10, 209:11, 209:12
 buses [3] - 209:9, 209:11, 253:7
 Bushes [1] - 115:17
 business [20] - 12:15, 21:25, 43:6.
55:24, 55:25, 63:14, 110:1, 211:10,
211:14, 213:16, 215:7, 215:17, 243:16,
254:11, 257:7, 258:19, 285:12, 285:15,
297:23
 businesses [1] - 216:7
 busy [2] - 23:5, 205:20
 buy [12] - 32:24, 33:15, 217:6, 230:22,
231:10, 231:14, 257:16, 269:4, 274:17,
285:18, 288:7, 298:15
 buyers [2] - 237:8, 252:16
 buying [3] - 217:3, 230:23, 254:6
 BY [24] - 135:21, 152:23, 153:6, 153:15,
155:2, 165:12, 166:8, 210:18, 234:14,
234:21, 239:6, 239:16, 240:1, 243:7,
261:11, 262:12, 263:10, 264:3, 281:23,
282:7, 294:17, 295:7, 296:3, 296:22
                    C
 calculate [2] - 183:6, 321:18
 calculated [1] - 304:5
 calculating [1] - 117:23
 calculation [5] - 128:20, 183:20,
183:23, 183:24, 305:20
 calculations [1] - 305:2
 California [2] - 239:1, 283:9
 CALLED [3] - 135:20, 210:17, 281:22
 CAM [1] - 151:14
 Cambridge [4] - 95:3, 118:3, 118:6,
 Campbell [17] - 7:17, 8:1, 9:11, 27:4,
27:9, 28:14, 29:17, 58:20, 92:21, 101:6,
113:11, 113:13, 304:18, 313:12, 314:16,
316:2, 318:8
 CAMPBELL [27] - 7:8, 7:14, 7:24, 9:13,
10:3, 10:5, 10:13, 28:15, 92:24, 113:12,
303:4, 307:21, 308:7, 308:15, 308:19,
309:4, 309:8, 310:2, 310:9, 310:13,
313:13, 315:6, 316:4, 316:21, 317:18,
318:10, 324:1
 campus [1] - 34:7
 candidness [1] - 61:24
 candor [4] - 47:2, 47:7, 62:8, 62:17
 cannot [10] - 77:12, 77:13, 82:3, 84:3,
84:7, 159:7, 165:2, 189:17, 203:24,
```

capability [1] - 201:12

capitalist [2] - 137:22, 217:9

216:25. 218:24

227:17, 234:1

capital [6] - 216:3, 216:4, 216:5, 216:6,

capitalists [5] - 216:9, 217:3, 217:5,

```
car [2] - 283:22, 284:1
 care [4] - 6:7, 15:6, 18:19, 24:15
 careful [6] - 10:16, 10:19, 253:5,
322:12, 323:1, 323:10
 carefully [2] - 109:10, 174:19
 Carl [1] - 23:7
 Carol [2] - 136:3, 136:5
 Carolyn [1] - 18:25
 Carrier's [1] - 16:8
 carry [1] - 86:11
 case [161] - 10:16, 10:20, 10:25, 11:15,
12:16, 12:19, 13:1, 23:20, 25:14, 26:1,
26:11, 26:24, 27:8, 27:9, 29:1, 29:14,
30:17, 30:23, 35:11, 35:15, 35:20,
35:21, 37:21, 43:15, 46:1, 46:7, 46:11,
46:15, 46:22, 48:3, 48:4, 48:5, 49:2,
49:22, 49:25, 50:2, 52:23, 53:2, 55:23,
57:11, 59:19, 59:20, 59:22, 60:3, 61:16,
66:18, 72:17, 72:19, 72:23, 73:6, 73:8,
73:10, 74:8, 75:7, 75:19, 77:12, 77:13,
77:14, 77:16, 77:17, 77:19, 77:22, 78:1,
78:9, 78:12, 78:13, 78:16, 78:18, 78:20,
78:25, 79:5, 79:7, 80:6, 81:9, 81:25,
87:15, 91:7, 92:12, 93:7, 94:7, 94:8,
97:3, 98:20, 99:12, 100:3, 101:10,
101:22, 102:5, 103:10, 103:25, 105:5,
105:14, 106:13, 111:1, 112:25, 113:22,
114:6, 116:8, 116:10, 118:15, 121:16,
124:13, 127:23, 134:17, 149:21, 150:15,
150:24, 152:12, 156:1, 160:23, 167:9,
168:2, 180:24, 202:17, 203:10, 204:3,
226:13, 227:3, 227:4, 230:2, 230:15,
233:21, 236:9, 238:2, 242:1, 242:12,
248:7, 248:11, 249:1, 249:15, 250:4,
252:8, 261:23, 262:14, 262:23, 263:2,
263:13, 265:14, 266:3, 270:1, 272:2,
272:7, 273:8, 277:10, 280:12, 291:3,
291:13, 292:12, 298:7, 299:5, 311:14,
313:16, 314:12, 317:11, 318:17, 319:2,
319:3, 320:3
 cases [7] - 11:15, 30:13, 30:14, 92:5,
180:6, 245:1, 307:10
 Casey [1] - 53:5
 cash [2] - 170:6, 190:22
 Castine [1] - 315:17
 catch [1] - 32:23
 categories [13] - 158:6, 158:10, 219:12,
219:23, 219:25, 220:3, 228:19, 230:20,
231:5, 232:25, 251:23, 254:21, 255:5
 categorization [2] - 228:4, 228:5
 categorizations [1] - 166:14
 categorize [1] - 220:1
 categorized [1] - 228:2
 category [10] - 228:13, 228:21, 229:7,
230:1, 231:1, 231:6, 231:8, 231:10,
255:9, 316:14
 caused [4] - 53:23, 163:15, 246:4,
247:24
 causes [1] - 185:19
 caution [3] - 10:14, 76:14, 76:18
```

```
CBS [1] - 223:25
 cell [2] - 78:21, 283:22
 center [2] - 121:6, 127:2
 centers [1] - 221:9
 central [1] - 12:12
 cents [1] - 106:8
 certain [12] - 30:10, 40:24, 66:12,
66:16, 81:2, 172:8, 195:9, 233:15,
244:7, 270:21, 302:18, 307:2
 certainly [18] - 38:23, 43:19, 62:20,
66:8, 67:14, 97:2, 174:6, 174:17,
184:18, 186:1, 201:17, 206:2, 227:18,
232:13, 247:21, 267:16, 319:5, 322:15
 CERTIFICATION [1] - 324:13
 CERTIFY [1] - 324:14
 cetera [1] - 289:10
 Chad [2] - 27:9, 113:13
 chain [1] - 186:10
 chairman [1] - 215:1
 challenges [1] - 64:5
 chance [2] - 45:10, 98:9
 Chandler [2] - 20:7, 20:8
 change [10] - 190:2, 244:17, 244:18,
244:19, 244:21, 244:24, 249:4, 268:15,
318:7, 318:18
 changed [4] - 115:5, 190:4, 201:16,
311:22
 changes [4] - 114:4, 190:3, 190:5,
 changing [1] - 317:25
 channel [1] - 187:12
 channels [1] - 187:21
 chapter [2] - 103:6
 characterize [2] - 257:23, 258:2
 charge [12] - 8:9, 140:18, 140:21,
246:22, 284:22, 307:22, 308:3, 309:21,
310:3, 314:4, 314:25, 315:16
 charged [2] - 203:2, 219:9
 charging [1] - 284:20
 Charles [1] - 18:7
 Charlie [2] - 34:23, 34:25
 chart [2] - 101:1, 110:7
 Cheatham [3] - 19:9, 19:10, 34:1
 Check [1] - 149:15
 check [9] - 25:22, 98:13, 98:21, 117:6,
117:9, 131:8, 177:11, 180:5, 273:5
 checked [1] - 256:15
 checks [3] - 96:24, 97:1, 97:2
 Chicken [1] - 20:20
 chicken [1] - 213:6
 Chief [1] - 11:17
 chief [16] - 138:12, 138:14, 138:16,
138:18, 139:7, 145:4, 146:24, 153:7,
186:4, 215:18, 219:18, 265:9, 270:5,
270:11, 272:19
 child [7] - 16:5, 16:6, 16:15, 23:2, 23:3,
23:12, 30:18
 children [24] - 15:8, 15:14, 15:22, 16:9,
16:22, 17:4, 17:15, 17:24, 18:12, 18:19,
19:4, 19:19, 20:9, 20:18, 21:2, 21:12,
```

```
21:23, 22:6, 22:17, 23:1, 45:19, 136:4,
                                             263:11, 264:18, 264:20, 288:5, 291:8,
210:25. 282:14
                                             308:5, 308:8, 308:17, 308:22, 308:23,
 chip [28] - 33:20, 33:21, 122:11,
122:18, 122:22, 123:7, 123:19, 123:23,
124:3, 124:6, 126:7, 127:4, 129:7,
147:10, 147:11, 147:16, 147:20, 158:21,
214:25, 292:8, 313:19, 314:7, 314:12,
314:13
 chip-to-chip [1] - 127:4
 chips [33] - 94:12, 102:10, 102:12,
102:15, 102:17, 102:18, 104:2, 104:15,
105:16, 106:1, 106:2, 107:1, 108:5,
108:10, 117:17, 118:5, 118:9, 118:10,
125:4, 127:12, 127:16, 130:12, 130:16,
131:24, 132:18, 147:8, 158:21, 163:21,
308:25, 309:11, 313:24, 314:13
 choices [1] - 209:5
 choosing [2] - 127:20, 164:25
 chose [2] - 318:2
 chosen [4] - 70:16, 70:21, 70:23
 Chris [6] - 11:25, 28:7, 34:23, 34:24,
34:25, 104:5
 Christian [1] - 18:2
 CHRISTINA [1] - 324:19
 chronologically [1] - 190:20
 chunk [2] - 190:14, 258:17
 chunked [1] - 259:1
 Church [2] - 19:11, 34:2
 church [2] - 21:16, 34:7
 circuit [30] - 80:21, 97:13, 108:11,
110:15, 110:21, 110:22, 110:23, 111:10,
117:9, 117:23, 125:1, 130:22, 132:16,
183:5, 183:8, 183:10, 183:14, 183:21,
184:6, 184:25, 196:1, 200:23, 208:9,
208:13, 208:14, 208:15, 208:17, 242:3,
242:6
 circuitry [2] - 102:16, 242:2
 circuits [30] - 94:15, 97:10, 102:15,
103:15, 104:17, 110:17, 111:9, 120:20,
120:21, 121:13, 122:6, 122:10, 122:13,
123:1, 123:15, 124:25, 132:13, 132:15,
152:18, 152:24, 153:22, 165:1, 166:21,
181:15, 181:24, 182:9, 198:13, 208:2,
 circumstances [4] - 41:1, 78:10,
202:18, 204:22
 cited [3] - 85:16, 307:10, 311:14
 Civil [1] - 266:20
 civil [1] - 79:12
 claim [108] - 8:21, 9:3, 9:7, 9:23, 10:2,
48:17, 48:19, 62:2, 63:1, 73:23, 80:11,
80:12, 80:16, 80:18, 80:21, 83:25, 85:3,
87:6, 88:2, 88:3, 88:10, 90:8, 90:9,
90:20, 92:1, 100:15, 100:16, 100:17,
100:19, 101:11, 101:20, 101:21, 107:19,
109:6, 109:8, 110:23, 118:20, 119:10,
124:14, 124:19, 124:21, 131:12, 132:17,
132:20, 132:25, 149:24, 150:1, 150:3,
150:4, 150:5, 165:15, 183:12, 185:4,
206:20, 206:24, 207:11, 207:24, 208:8,
208:21, 228:15, 228:24, 260:18, 263:8,
```

```
309:18, 309:23, 309:24, 310:5, 310:16,
310:20, 310:21, 310:24, 310:25, 311:1,
311:7, 311:16, 311:21, 311:23, 311:25,
312:3, 312:13, 312:19, 312:24, 313:9,
313:14, 313:25, 314:3, 314:19, 315:13,
316:23, 316:24, 317:3, 317:11, 317:14
 Claim [1] - 80:8
 claimed [16] - 84:13, 85:10, 86:21,
87:1, 189:1, 189:15, 192:16, 192:22,
193:9, 199:24, 224:19, 247:5, 249:7,
249:19, 250:3
 claiming [1] - 228:16
 claims [90] - 6:25, 10:1, 48:9, 48:10,
56:10, 73:22, 74:1, 74:2, 80:5, 80:9,
83:24, 84:10, 84:24, 84:25, 85:2, 85:4,
86:3, 86:8, 86:23, 86:24, 87:7, 87:10,
87:21, 87:22, 87:25, 88:6, 88:8, 88:9,
89:18, 89:19, 89:20, 89:22, 89:23,
89:25, 90:3, 90:8, 90:11, 90:14, 90:15,
90:16, 90:19, 90:22, 107:11, 107:15,
109:8, 117:5, 118:18, 124:13, 124:14,
131:11, 149:18, 149:21, 150:1, 174:11,
174:15, 174:16, 174:19, 174:24, 228:22,
228:25, 229:2, 248:18, 249:6, 260:20,
261:4, 261:6, 261:8, 262:17, 263:12,
263:19, 263:20, 263:23, 264:10, 264:13,
264:16, 265:7, 288:2, 291:9, 291:10,
307:3, 308:21, 313:4, 314:14, 315:16,
315:22
 Claims [1] - 80:8
 Clara [1] - 283:9
 clarification [1] - 7:11
 clarified [1] - 183:3
 clarify [4] - 62:18, 62:21, 303:7, 306:7
 Clark [3] - 89:3, 171:17, 256:17
 classes [1] - 211:21
 classmate [2] - 214:3, 215:23
 clause [1] - 295:21
 clear [15] - 35:25, 36:8, 62:19, 84:20,
87:11, 91:22, 91:24, 92:2, 100:18,
116:10, 307:10, 308:10, 313:23, 322:18,
322:21
 clearly [3] - 249:13, 251:13, 303:21
 clerk [3] - 11:21, 14:18, 22:25
 client [9] - 45:23, 46:22, 50:5, 53:13,
94:8, 125:23, 140:1, 140:22
 client's [3] - 46:14, 53:14, 53:15
 clients [5] - 139:15, 139:23, 231:15,
284:15, 286:11
 climb [1] - 15:24
 close [7] - 36:18, 44:20, 48:23, 77:10,
188:22, 258:4, 321:2
 closely [1] - 151:4
 closet [1] - 175:10
 closing [3] - 73:12, 74:25, 76:21
 clusters [2] - 270:25, 278:14
 co [1] - 172:5
 co-inventors [1] - 172:5
 coal [1] - 21:22
```

```
code [29] - 102:8, 102:9, 102:20,
103:22, 108:9, 116:9, 122:23, 122:24,
123:4, 123:7, 123:8, 123:24, 123:25,
166:23, 192:12, 192:13, 194:10, 242:3,
242:5, 250:1, 250:6, 258:14, 291:5,
291:7, 300:1
 coding [1] - 103:7
 coined [1] - 284:13
 Coleman [1] - 53:5
 colinear [1] - 304:3
 collaborating [1] - 128:15
 colleagues [5] - 26:12, 95:16, 96:4,
96:6, 233:4
 collection [2] - 119:15
 College [2] - 18:1, 22:24
 college [7] - 15:16, 136:11, 169:24,
169:25, 198:2, 206:15, 283:5
 color[1] - 121:8
 Column [11] - 89:17, 121:25, 149:18,
149:19, 149:24, 177:6, 178:3, 179:8,
179:9, 180:8, 264:1
 column [4] - 80:9, 80:14, 80:20, 271:22
 Columns [1] - 174:1
 columns [2] - 89:14, 174:1
 com [2] - 144:22, 284:13
 combination [5] - 129:17, 131:7, 209:3,
285:11, 308:11
 combinations [1] - 309:1
 combine [1] - 131:7
 combining [1] - 129:19
 comfortable [4] - 44:1, 44:3, 44:7,
173:8
 coming [14] - 25:9, 67:25, 71:1, 94:5,
120:1, 120:2, 120:23, 121:21, 138:9,
174:14, 188:14, 211:21, 282:13, 321:2
 command [1] - 136:21
 comment [3] - 162:15, 165:2, 303:3
 commercial [1] - 220:24
 commercialize [2] - 218:6, 220:15
 commercialized [3] - 151:25, 217:20,
217:21
 commercially [2] - 188:11, 204:25
 commercials [1] - 55:10
 Commission [1] - 20:19
 committee [7] - 219:13, 219:14,
219:16, 219:17, 219:19, 219:21, 265:6
 common [6] - 176:20, 190:19, 195:17,
196:21, 300:12
 commonality [1] - 187:23
 commonly [3] - 196:8, 197:8, 197:14
 communicate [1] - 119:21
 communicated [2] - 158:14, 188:2
 communication [6] - 126:25, 127:9,
127:11, 127:12, 127:14, 187:3
 Communications [2] - 23:9, 109:17
 communications [3] - 127:1, 139:3,
279:16
 community [1] - 145:18
 Community [1] - 22:24
 companies [84] - 26:2, 26:3, 37:23,
```

```
39:2, 43:5, 50:15, 105:2, 105:3, 105:13,
106:15, 106:17, 106:23, 111:22, 112:1,
128:15, 134:1, 145:13, 145:16, 145:21,
157:21, 157:25, 158:7, 158:15, 158:19,
161:20, 161:25, 162:8, 166:13, 166:16,
167:2, 167:7, 167:12, 167:13, 167:21,
167:25, 168:6, 215:3, 217:1, 217:7,
217:22, 218:5, 219:7, 221:12, 221:23,
223:6, 223:25, 224:22, 228:3, 228:20,
230:17, 230:20, 230:21, 230:23, 231:4,
231:19, 236:6, 236:19, 237:13, 237:20,
242:21, 253:25, 254:7, 257:9, 261:16,
261:23, 261:25, 262:4, 285:21, 292:1,
292:2, 292:6, 292:12, 298:5, 298:18,
298:19, 300:6, 300:8, 300:13, 300:21,
300:23, 300:24, 301:2, 301:3
 company [125] - 19:18, 21:11, 21:22,
37:24, 38:2, 39:11, 40:2, 40:24, 40:25,
41:2, 41:4, 41:9, 41:10, 41:11, 42:6,
42:10, 42:13, 42:14, 42:15, 43:4, 93:12,
93:14, 94:10, 95:2, 96:2, 105:1, 109:17,
109:19, 109:25, 112:2, 113:15, 115:21,
126:9, 126:10, 137:5, 137:14, 137:24,
137:25, 138:13, 139:19, 144:25, 145:2,
145:6, 146:3, 146:25, 147:7, 147:13,
147:24, 147:25, 148:1, 153:7, 153:23,
156:20, 161:18, 162:7, 163:24, 164:5,
164:7, 167:17, 170:1, 170:3, 213:13,
214:5, 214:7, 214:8, 214:14, 215:1,
215:11, 215:13, 216:3, 216:4, 216:5,
216:7, 216:8, 216:10, 216:11, 216:23,
218:20, 220:17, 220:18, 221:4, 221:11,
221:17, 223:20, 225:15, 225:18, 226:1,
226:10, 227:15, 227:23, 228:2, 231:6,
231:9, 231:11, 232:17, 236:7, 237:2,
238:3, 238:5, 238:7, 242:22, 254:5,
254:14, 258:16, 269:3, 274:2, 274:10,
275:2, 285:4, 285:5, 292:3, 292:4,
292:5, 298:20, 298:21
 company's [1] - 278:7
 compare [2] - 90:5, 90:9
 compared [3] - 134:2, 179:22, 260:12
 comparing [1] - 209:13
 comparison [1] - 106:25
 comparisons [1] - 134:8
 compelled [1] - 82:25
 compensate [3] - 67:10, 88:13, 88:15
 compensated [4] - 203:9, 203:24,
239:12, 301:3
 compensation [3] - 100:3, 233:18,
233:19
 competitive [2] - 139:19, 142:14
 competitors [2] - 84:21, 85:23
 complete [3] - 191:19, 191:20, 191:22
 completely [1] - 196:25
 complicated [3] - 95:5, 116:4, 186:11
 component [3] - 32:17, 32:25, 175:24
 components [2] - 240:5, 289:21
 compounds [1] - 304:24
 comprising [1] - 101:8
 computation [3] - 184:12, 184:14,
```

```
184:17
 computations [1] - 97:12
 compute [1] - 228:7
 computed [1] - 322:5
 computer [42] - 19:17, 25:20, 32:16,
32:24, 33:13, 33:21, 54:19, 55:2, 55:12,
94:12, 95:18, 95:22, 96:13, 96:14, 98:5,
102:9, 103:4, 106:1, 106:2, 108:2,
108:5, 119:24, 120:7, 120:14, 120:23,
122:23, 126:22, 127:2, 127:13, 158:21,
163:21, 166:23, 169:16, 175:20, 195:19,
206:6, 212:9, 212:16, 254:8, 283:22
 computers [21] - 44:4, 44:5, 44:8, 44:9,
54:25, 58:23, 95:23, 96:10, 97:19,
97:20, 97:24, 108:5, 108:7, 115:6,
119:15, 119:23, 130:11, 166:1, 217:18,
286:13
 computing [5] - 114:4, 115:6, 119:11,
251:5
 conceivable [1] - 76:4
 conceived [2] - 161:15, 188:25
 concept [18] - 48:18, 48:20, 49:7,
49:11, 119:14, 185:3, 188:7, 188:11,
196:24, 198:17, 207:5, 207:6, 207:9,
207:24, 209:11, 209:12, 209:13, 209:14
 concern [8] - 167:22, 168:7, 237:20,
311:21, 321:7, 322:17, 322:19, 323:19
 concerned [6] - 85:1, 174:22, 237:16,
301:25, 316:9, 322:13
 concerning [6] - 49:14, 167:13, 236:8,
236:13, 236:20, 306:13
 concerns [3] - 167:12, 168:6, 236:20
 conclude [6] - 6:11, 73:16, 73:17,
103:23, 113:1, 281:8
 concluded [3] - 73:10, 86:16, 209:18
 concludes [4] - 92:18, 174:10, 209:19,
 concluding [1] - 23:22
 conclusion [7] - 8:6, 81:9, 112:18,
146:14, 204:23, 267:18, 275:7
 conclusions [1] - 75:12
 concrete [1] - 315:4
 conditioning [1] - 16:9
 conduct [1] - 63:14
 conducting [1] - 274:12
 conducts [1] - 268:10
 confer [1] - 76:9
 conference [5] - 8:5, 8:10, 307:22,
308:3, 314:25
 confess [1] - 96:23
 confidence [1] - 133:12
 confidential [2] - 166:23, 250:10
 configureable [3] - 178:1, 201:18,
201:22
 confine [1] - 294:11
 confines [1] - 323:18
 confining [1] - 206:23
 confirm [1] - 237:7
 confused [5] - 7:5, 68:16, 69:25,
155:20, 319:2
```

```
confusion [2] - 43:17, 305:10
 congratulations [2] - 55:6, 282:18
 connect [1] - 299:22
 connection [4] - 117:16, 172:11, 193:8,
226.4
 consequence [1] - 275:3
 consequences [1] - 98:10
 consider [18] - 38:24, 64:4, 74:18, 75:4,
75:5, 75:8, 75:9, 76:3, 76:7, 85:14, 87:9,
92:6, 102:22, 125:13, 226:18, 278:13,
294:13, 297:23
 consideration [2] - 110:4, 270:15
 considered [9] - 24:10, 76:4, 163:12,
176:2, 200:18, 205:13, 322:23, 323:6,
323:13
 considering [3] - 69:13, 128:9, 181:2
 considers [1] - 85:15
 consist [2] - 74:8, 85:17
 consistent [3] - 199:23, 309:14, 313:22
 constitutes [2] - 86:14, 293:16
 Construction [1] - 80:8
 construction [13] - 19:5, 21:15, 80:15,
80:17, 80:20, 80:22, 90:9, 90:22,
122:15, 311:21, 313:14, 313:25, 314:3
 constructions [14] - 80:19, 90:20,
90:24, 101:2, 311:23, 311:25, 312:4,
312:13, 312:20, 312:24, 313:1, 313:9,
313:15, 313:17
 construed [1] - 80:18
 consultant [1] - 155:22
 consulted [1] - 76:10
 consulting [7] - 147:19, 170:6, 170:17,
203:8, 203:12, 211:9, 286:10
 consuming [3] - 56:5, 56:7, 77:7
 contact [1] - 280:17
 contacted [2] - 147:22, 231:4
 contain [2] - 48:16, 175:6
 containing [1] - 175:20
 contains [2] - 84:17, 293:19
 contend [1] - 49:5
 contending [1] - 307:2
 contends [4] - 6:25, 88:1, 133:6, 133:7
 content [1] - 151:16
 contention [1] - 307:15
 contentions [5] - 6:10, 307:7, 307:9,
307:18, 308:1
 context [13] - 97:20, 99:12, 104:12,
179:10, 179:18, 181:1, 182:6, 183:16,
183:19, 201:7, 279:5, 308:2, 315:4
 continuation [5] - 248:2, 248:6,
248:12, 248:22, 249:4
 continue [10] - 9:25, 25:9, 210:6, 220:8,
220:9, 220:11, 246:22, 246:23, 248:17
 continued [3] - 195:8, 222:23, 246:12
 continues [1] - 261:7
 continuing [1] - 247:23
 continuously [3] - 141:18, 144:19,
299:16
 contract [7] - 139:18, 141:4, 141:7,
```

confusing [1] - 43:20

```
147:23, 148:10, 148:11, 204:4
 contractor [2] - 50:20, 137:8
 contracts [8] - 139:20, 140:20, 147:19,
173:4, 218:4, 220:10, 222:7, 227:14
 contradict [1] - 133:23
 contradicts [1] - 323:7
 contribution [1] - 145:17
 contributions [2] - 95:11, 115:15
 control [8] - 23:10, 130:24, 136:21,
146:20, 151:17, 151:19, 176:12, 253:11
 convenience [1] - 80:3
 conveniently [1] - 76:12
 conventional [1] - 187:4
 convergence [1] - 188:12
 conversation [1] - 78:4
 converted [1] - 214:1
 conviction [1] - 92:1
 convince [1] - 91:5
 convincing [6] - 35:25, 36:8, 87:11,
91:22, 91:24, 92:2
 cookie [3] - 245:25, 246:2, 246:17
 cookouts [1] - 16:25
 cool [1] - 168:1
 cooperative [1] - 324:6
 coprocessor [1] - 124:7
 copy [5] - 159:19, 194:4, 228:14,
228:15, 279:18
 copyright [1] - 199:1
 core [2] - 175:12, 223:19
 corner [1] - 207:21
 Corporate [1] - 143:16
 corporate [3] - 26:12, 27:16, 268:2
 corporation [5] - 50:12, 53:24, 56:5,
56:14, 267:2
 Corporation [15] - 13:3, 25:18, 26:6,
27:8, 27:12, 31:5, 45:23, 50:12, 50:18,
50:20, 50:21, 137:6, 190:22, 204:11,
266:19
 corporations [1] - 50:14
 CORRECT [1] - 324:15
 correct [108] - 41:15, 68:14, 86:21,
155:7, 155:8, 156:1, 156:10, 156:12,
156:15, 156:16, 156:20, 156:24, 157:3,
157:5, 157:11, 157:18, 157:19, 158:4,
158:8, 158:22, 159:15, 160:5, 160:10,
161:8, 161:16, 162:8, 162:13, 163:16,
164:3, 164:7, 178:12, 180:4, 180:23,
185:13, 191:25, 195:2, 195:3, 200:24,
201:18, 204:18, 206:7, 206:17, 206:21,
207:11, 207:13, 207:14, 207:16, 207:17,
208:4, 208:5, 208:11, 208:14, 208:18,
240:3, 243:18, 243:22, 244:1, 244:10,
245:2, 245:5, 245:7, 245:17, 245:21,
246:5, 246:11, 246:13, 247:1, 249:13,
249:21, 250:2, 250:18, 250:22, 251:1,
251:12, 251:18, 252:23, 253:17, 254:24,
255:10, 256:11, 257:17, 260:22, 261:3,
261:13, 261:19, 261:24, 262:3, 262:6,
263:20, 263:21, 269:11, 269:15, 269:18,
```

269:25, 271:20, 275:22, 276:22, 279:3,

```
279:8, 279:12, 279:23, 279:25, 280:6,
                                             306:1, 306:6, 306:11, 306:17, 306:20,
295:5, 307:19, 308:15, 309:4, 310:14
                                             307:6, 307:15, 307:20, 308:4, 308:13,
                                             308:16, 309:2, 309:5, 309:20, 310:7,
 correctional [1] - 22:24
                                             310:10, 310:15, 311:20, 313:12, 314:16,
 corrections [1] - 174:9
                                             315:7, 315:10, 316:2, 316:13, 316:22,
 correlation [1] - 256:23
                                             317:15, 317:20, 318:8, 318:20, 318:24,
 corrupted [2] - 95:21, 98:13
                                             319:7, 319:18, 320:16, 320:24, 322:5,
 cost [5] - 134:6, 229:21, 261:18,
                                             322:7, 323:15, 323:24, 324:3, 324:5,
261:19, 262:2
                                             324:13
 costs [2] - 253:12, 261:17
                                               court [88] - 6:4, 6:11, 6:16, 6:17, 8:7,
 counsel [14] - 71:24, 93:21, 112:13,
                                             8:14, 9:8, 9:17, 11:22, 11:24, 11:25,
134:13, 154:23, 202:9, 219:18, 232:11,
                                             12:8, 12:9, 23:25, 29:16, 39:5, 39:6,
238:14, 267:9, 269:15, 270:11, 272:19,
302:11
                                             47:22, 49:5, 49:9, 62:21, 63:16, 63:19,
                                             63:25, 65:24, 68:7, 72:8, 76:14, 77:2,
 counsel's [2] - 269:12, 270:6
                                             79:15, 80:18, 81:15, 83:24, 87:1, 90:19,
 counselor [1] - 29:22
                                             90:20, 90:22, 92:22, 93:21, 133:10,
 count [2] - 271:10, 271:13
                                             135:2, 135:15, 135:17, 148:3, 160:9,
 counted [1] - 69:1
                                             165:10, 168:13, 203:25, 210:3, 210:15,
 countersue [1] - 253:10
                                             210:21, 218:11, 221:14, 253:16, 253:21,
 country [4] - 14:15, 37:2, 85:11, 115:15
                                             258:11, 258:13, 261:6, 281:17, 281:20,
 country's [3] - 95:4, 95:11, 143:23
                                             291:16, 291:17, 292:13, 295:4, 297:15,
 counts [2] - 169:3, 169:4
                                             301:20, 301:24, 302:7, 303:12, 303:17,
 County [2] - 17:10, 19:2
                                             303:21, 307:11, 311:13, 312:19, 313:5,
 couple [15] - 110:25, 120:19, 130:7,
                                             313:15, 313:17, 316:16, 319:23, 320:3,
170:2, 172:20, 172:21, 180:13, 198:24,
                                             321:9, 321:12, 321:19, 322:4, 322:20,
203:16, 204:2, 230:19, 243:11, 282:23,
                                             324:7
284:11, 291:25
                                               Court's [1] - 80:8
 course [24] - 12:17, 32:19, 37:2, 65:24,
                                               court's [11] - 80:15, 80:20, 80:22, 90:8,
66:14, 83:7, 83:20, 87:19, 97:19, 98:25,
                                             92:9, 92:14, 101:2, 122:15, 313:25,
110:19, 114:2, 115:13, 116:10, 167:5,
                                             314:2, 321:7
167:11, 190:2, 205:3, 206:5, 236:18,
                                               courthouse [1] - 134:22
280:11, 288:3, 321:11, 322:24
                                               courtroom [10] - 11:21, 11:24, 25:12,
 courses [1] - 312:22
                                             70:11, 72:11, 78:23, 79:3, 79:11, 82:9,
 Court [3] - 11:12, 11:16, 266:20
                                             93:8
 COURT [197] - 6:6, 6:20, 7:2, 7:7, 7:10,
                                               courtrooms [1] - 14:15
7:15, 7:20, 8:1, 8:17, 9:11, 9:19, 10:4,
                                               covenant [1] - 297:19
10:6, 10:9, 10:14, 11:5, 11:10, 15:10,
                                               cover [13] - 94:19, 97:15, 114:9,
15:18, 16:1, 16:11, 16:17, 17:1, 17:7,
                                              159:18, 160:2, 228:18, 232:4, 248:24,
17:12, 17:19, 18:5, 18:16, 18:23, 19:7,
                                             249:2, 255:8, 262:18, 264:16, 264:17
19:14, 19:22, 20:4, 20:12, 20:22, 21:6,
                                               covered [6] - 84:21, 90:3, 166:17,
21:18, 22:2, 22:12, 22:21, 23:6, 23:14,
                                              288:22, 297:4, 307:6
24:12, 24:17, 24:22, 24:25, 25:7, 25:13,
                                               covers [2] - 90:2, 127:11
26:7, 27:4, 27:15, 28:9, 28:19, 31:12,
                                               Cowboys [1] - 36:3
33:3, 45:14, 47:3, 51:10, 62:18, 63:9,
                                               cows [1] - 18:15
63:11, 63:21, 64:2, 64:10, 64:12, 64:17,
                                               Cox [1] - 21:8
65:5, 65:18, 66:2, 66:10, 66:22, 66:25,
                                               CPU [3] - 96:11, 175:24
67:6, 67:16, 67:21, 67:24, 68:5, 68:9,
                                               CPUs [1] - 190:18
68:18, 68:22, 69:6, 69:14, 69:18, 69:21,
                                               Craig [2] - 186:3, 186:4
69:23, 70:1, 70:5, 70:8, 70:13, 72:3,
                                               crash [1] - 284:13
72:12, 72:15, 79:21, 92:25, 93:4, 93:6,
                                               CRC [126] - 25:21, 80:21, 94:13, 94:15,
93:14, 93:17, 113:11, 134:13, 135:4,
                                             94:24, 97:4, 97:8, 97:10, 98:16, 98:24,
135:11, 135:16, 135:18, 152:22, 153:4,
                                             99:2, 103:15, 104:16, 104:17, 104:23,
153:14, 154:20, 154:24, 165:8, 166:7,
                                             108:10, 110:15, 113:3, 115:1, 117:2,
168:10, 168:12, 168:20, 168:23, 169:5,
                                             117:14, 117:15, 117:19, 120:20, 120:24,
209:21, 209:24, 210:5, 210:12, 243:3,
                                             121:2, 121:5, 121:11, 121:13, 121:14,
243:5, 261:10, 262:9, 265:17, 265:19,
                                             121:23, 122:5, 122:12, 123:1, 123:14,
265:23, 266:1, 266:8, 281:3, 281:8,
                                             124:11, 124:23, 124:25, 126:24, 127:10,
281:12, 281:19, 282:2, 282:6, 293:25,
                                             128:1, 128:2, 128:8, 128:20, 129:3.
294:5, 294:11, 294:23, 295:6, 296:1,
                                             129:7. 129:11. 129:24. 130:2. 130:3.
296:21, 301:7, 301:12, 301:15, 302:9,
                                             130:12, 130:22, 131:1, 131:17, 131:20,
302:22, 303:1, 303:6, 303:13, 304:9,
                                             131:22, 132:4, 132:9, 132:15, 132:18,
```

304:18, 304:21, 305:6, 305:16, 305:23,

```
132:23, 152:24, 166:21, 176:20, 177:11,
177:12, 177:15, 178:4, 178:7, 178:8,
178:10, 178:13, 178:18, 179:21, 179:23,
180:23, 181:3, 181:7, 181:16, 181:20,
182:1, 182:5, 182:9, 182:18, 183:5,
183:7, 183:13, 183:18, 183:20, 184:2,
184:4, 184:14, 184:16, 185:11, 185:12,
190:1, 193:18, 194:20, 195:4, 195:25,
196:6, 197:7, 197:14, 197:17, 198:4,
200:5, 200:9, 200:22, 205:8, 205:10,
207:22, 207:25, 208:1, 208:2, 209:7,
209:13, 209:16, 209:18, 268:19
 CRC-10 [10] - 121:17, 122:16, 123:2,
123:6, 123:16, 195:1, 196:18, 196:21,
208:15, 209:4
 CRC-16 [3] - 195:1, 208:13, 209:5
 CRC-32 [14] - 121:23, 122:16, 123:1,
123:16, 195:1, 196:10, 196:25, 197:1,
197:5, 197:9, 205:12, 208:6, 208:9,
 CRC-8 [11] - 195:2, 195:4, 195:7, 195:8,
196:14, 197:20, 198:1, 198:6, 198:11,
208:17, 209:4
 CRCs [20] - 117:6, 117:16, 119:9,
120:8, 120:9, 120:16, 124:6, 125:9,
125:11, 126:16, 128:16, 128:25, 129:19,
152:16, 153:22, 155:10, 155:12, 178:16,
178:20, 181:5
 create [4] - 24:19, 206:10, 217:6,
231:14
 created [4] - 192:2, 192:19, 223:9,
223:11
 creates [1] - 285:14
 creation [2] - 86:10, 199:7
 creative [2] - 259:23, 260:9
 creativity [2] - 115:25, 260:11
 credit [2] - 20:25, 144:5
 Crescent [6] - 170:13, 171:4, 171:10,
171:11, 171:14, 186:13
 criminal [2] - 30:17, 92:5
 critical [3] - 12:12, 220:10, 240:5
 CROSS [2] - 155:1, 243:6
 cross [2] - 9:6, 301:13
 CROSS-EXAMINATION [2] - 155:1,
 cross-examination [2] - 9:6, 301:13
 CRR [2] - 324:19, 324:20
 cryptography [1] - 255:2
 CTO [4] - 144:25, 145:4, 145:6, 171:14
 curious [1] - 205:16
 current [7] - 138:11, 182:12, 183:13,
183:16, 183:21, 184:2, 243:25
 customer [2] - 222:16, 222:19
 customers [6] - 99:5, 99:9, 139:23,
139:24, 223:23, 223:24
 customized [1] - 232:6
 cut [1] - 102:15
 Cyclic [1] - 149:15
```

cyclic [6] - 96:23, 97:1, 97:2, 117:6,

117:8, 177:11

```
Cynthia [1] - 21:19
                   D
 damage [1] - 9:7
 damages [31] - 8:21, 9:3, 9:23, 10:1,
10:2, 49:23, 50:3, 50:7, 67:9, 67:11,
84:7, 88:12, 88:14, 88:17, 91:18, 104:5,
133:5, 133:8, 133:9, 316:24, 317:3,
317:7, 317:13, 317:23, 319:14, 319:21,
320:4, 320:6, 320:8, 322:1, 322:3
 DANA [1] - 266:15
 Dana [3] - 28:13, 266:11, 266:17
 DARPA [11] - 140:1, 140:2, 140:3,
141:4, 141:24, 142:10, 142:11, 142:17,
143:2, 146:20
 das [10] - 28:16, 116:25, 127:25,
128:13, 128:15, 129:9, 130:1, 130:4,
131:2, 299:11
 Data [1] - 193:25
 data [49] - 95:18, 95:20, 97:18, 97:19,
97:21, 97:25, 98:1, 98:8, 98:13, 98:20,
114:24, 115:1, 126:21, 127:1, 141:22,
164:18, 164:21, 176:12, 177:2, 179:20,
182:12, 182:18, 182:24, 182:25, 183:1,
183:2, 183:13, 183:25, 184:3, 184:5,
185:7, 185:9, 185:11, 185:21, 190:13,
190:15, 190:18, 195:18, 195:19, 196:13,
213:17, 215:20, 217:16, 217:17, 228:5,
251:10
 database [1] - 173:4
 date [16] - 31:20, 89:1, 148:13, 148:25,
189:9, 189:17, 191:6, 194:3, 199:1,
223:2, 232:7, 244:24, 250:21, 255:22,
269:19, 275:21
 DATE [1] - 324:14
 dated [6] - 149:1, 232:9, 275:14,
275:19, 277:25, 278:8
 dates [3] - 189:2, 189:6, 255:20
 Daubert [1] - 321:10
 daughter [6] - 19:4, 20:2, 20:9, 20:18,
29:23, 30:2
 Dave [9] - 269:21, 270:4, 270:6, 270:9,
270:11, 272:9, 273:9
 David [14] - 22:3, 22:6, 27:11, 32:1,
32:8, 41:17, 44:11, 52:6, 56:12, 60:1,
154:22, 155:3, 243:9, 272:20
 Davis [1] - 11:17
 day-by-day [1] - 283:21
 Daymon [1] - 19:25
 days [5] - 13:10, 197:19, 203:16, 204:2,
258:24
 deal [7] - 14:21, 92:11, 120:1, 177:4,
187:24, 236:15, 302:12
 dealing [4] - 85:4, 238:11, 238:13,
287:8
 dealings [1] - 238:20
 deals [1] - 103:9
 dealt [1] - 101:15
```

```
Debendra [5] - 28:16, 116:24, 127:25,
130:4, 131:2
 Debra [1] - 53:4
 decade [1] - 284:9
 December [4] - 170:9, 170:11, 170:12,
171:10
 decide [16] - 49:14, 72:24, 73:2, 76:20,
82:17, 88:7, 88:10, 88:12, 90:25,
100:21, 102:24, 108:17, 134:9, 227:20,
273:2, 316:18
 decided [4] - 97:9, 227:22, 233:4,
284:19
 decides [2] - 83:11, 86:19
 deciding [8] - 86:1, 90:11, 92:5, 236:3,
246:22, 257:16, 278:23, 279:11
 decision [17] - 62:3, 63:2, 65:16, 73:2,
75:7, 76:23, 125:21, 126:2, 225:2,
227:6, 227:7, 262:23, 274:20, 279:9,
314:17, 314:20, 323:7
 declaratory [2] - 253:11, 254:2
 decline [3] - 236:3, 278:23, 279:11
 declining [2] - 279:25, 280:3
 decode [3] - 180:22, 181:8, 195:9
 decodes [1] - 180:19
 decoding [3] - 181:6, 208:20, 208:22
 decomposition [2] - 103:19, 311:1
 dedicated [2] - 175:19, 206:10
 defend [1] - 87:4
 defendant [10] - 13:3, 25:2, 25:18,
36:15, 49:4, 73:9, 73:20, 169:4, 204:12,
 defendant's [1] - 81:7
 Defendant's [4] - 5:16, 5:17, 162:22,
 defendants [5] - 36:7, 245:12, 321:9,
321:22, 322:19
 Defense [1] - 140:3
 defense [9] - 50:20, 92:1, 107:6,
108:15, 137:8, 141:22, 141:23, 163:2,
261:17
 defenses [2] - 73:24, 133:13
 defensive [1] - 230:22
 defer [1] - 9:8
 define [6] - 86:8, 89:22, 89:23, 90:1,
120:8, 229:2
 defined [3] - 85:7, 264:10, 288:5
 defines [2] - 100:19, 288:4
 definitely [1] - 289:25
 definition [5] - 110:14, 131:21, 132:5,
178:15, 178:16
 definitively [1] - 267:22
 degree [8] - 136:13, 136:14, 169:18,
184:12, 192:11, 212:8, 283:9
 degrees [3] - 169:14, 212:7, 212:13
 delay [1] - 213:25
 delete [1] - 9:24
 deleted [1] - 252:15
 deliberate [3] - 13:7, 73:13, 76:23
 deliberately [1] - 252:17
 deliberations [7] - 77:1, 77:4, 77:6,
```

debate [1] - 315:12

```
77:21, 134:11, 134:18, 301:23
 delivered [1] - 176:13
 delivers [1] - 226:1
 Dell [1] - 221:12
 Delta [1] - 275:17
 democracy [1] - 12:6
 demonstrating [1] - 103:8
 demonstrating) [1] - 103:6
 Demultiplexer [1] - 181:13
 demultiplexer [7] - 103:16, 103:17,
107:23, 122:8, 131:13, 180:19, 181:24
 Demux [2] - 208:19, 208:20
 Denning [1] - 20:11
 deny [1] - 306:7
 depart [1] - 313:25
 Department [1] - 19:2
 department [2] - 141:23, 265:10
 departments [1] - 220:10
 depended [2] - 46:10, 202:16
 depicted [4] - 175:3, 176:22, 182:15,
208:3
 depicting [1] - 176:20
 deployed [2] - 143:10, 143:11
 depose [1] - 314:8
 deposit [3] - 98:12, 98:14
 deposition [15] - 28:3, 38:13, 74:9,
74:10, 74:15, 112:15, 153:13, 155:5,
156:22, 169:1, 169:2, 193:12, 209:18,
266:12, 266:17
 DEPOSITION [2] - 169:6, 266:15
 Depot [2] - 15:13, 15:14
 deputy [3] - 11:24, 19:3, 82:9
 derivative [1] - 199:16
 derived [4] - 133:22, 173:19, 199:8,
 describe [15] - 25:13, 48:10, 48:11,
72:19, 130:8, 146:1, 169:10, 197:5,
204:22, 208:25, 243:22, 244:5, 244:25,
261:20, 297:21
 described [9] - 62:25, 85:12, 121:24,
172:11, 192:16, 245:23, 246:1, 263:19,
314:1
 Description [2] - 177:7, 264:1
 description [6] - 25:25, 72:16, 84:18,
124:15, 264:9, 288:1
 descriptive [1] - 174:2
 design [19] - 96:16, 103:9, 137:14,
142:1, 142:4, 148:11, 170:21, 172:16,
173:22, 189:5, 189:23, 189:25, 191:20,
192:10, 192:11, 200:13, 200:14, 200:21,
255:4
 designed [14] - 118:10, 118:14, 122:12,
122:22, 125:7, 147:8, 147:9, 170:3,
170:20, 170:22, 192:8, 213:22, 213:24,
309:12
 designer [2] - 17:22, 22:18
 designing [5] - 118:7, 124:1, 141:2,
170:6, 190:12
 designs [1] - 179:6
 desktop [1] - 96:13
```

```
despite [1] - 111:22
 destroyed [1] - 81:16
 detail [6] - 6:24, 57:21, 113:22, 198:5,
200:1, 222:4
 Detailed [2] - 177:7, 264:1
 detailed [6] - 142:4, 241:20, 241:22,
242:6, 264:8, 308:23
 details [6] - 133:2, 172:17, 189:21,
200:21, 207:16, 229:6
 detect [2] - 98:21, 143:6
 detecting [1] - 143:5
 detection [9] - 94:13, 94:24, 97:8,
98:16, 103:7, 139:6, 152:16, 222:18
 detects [1] - 99:7
 determination [1] - 274:22
 determine [13] - 82:16, 84:9, 87:10,
88:19, 90:6, 99:9, 166:17, 187:18,
241:8, 241:23, 254:23, 268:17, 273:17
 determined [2] - 90:7, 291:7
 determines [2] - 175:25, 320:4
 determining [2] - 85:14, 181:4
 devastating [1] - 111:1
 developed [13] - 38:4, 109:18, 114:6,
116:1, 116:2, 116:22, 118:21, 132:18,
217:19, 218:4, 221:24, 222:6, 224:18
 developer [1] - 15:21
 developing [3] - 114:3, 190:22, 268:3
 development [17] - 20:1, 52:10, 52:11,
115:20, 139:18, 141:12, 148:24, 159:9,
161:7, 191:17, 215:17, 215:20, 217:15,
225:11, 232:17, 232:21, 286:16
 developments [1] - 115:10
 develops [1] - 9:4
 device [21] - 95:16, 95:18, 101:8,
101:9, 101:21, 141:5, 150:2, 150:3,
150:4, 164:20, 164:23, 164:25, 165:18,
185:1, 187:24, 263:15, 263:16, 263:19,
264:20
 devices [8] - 78:22, 79:3, 96:12, 96:17,
103:24, 165:22, 165:23, 166:10
 diagram [1] - 117:20
 diagrams [3] - 249:23, 287:25, 288:2
 dial [1] - 226:4
 dialogue [1] - 267:11
 dictate [1] - 200:24
 dictated [2] - 183:7, 183:11
 dictionary [1] - 80:23
 die [2] - 247:19, 247:21
 differ [1] - 288:2
 difference [1] - 100:13
 differences [4] - 114:21, 115:3, 127:21,
130.8
 different [87] - 32:18, 35:24, 65:21,
66:14, 82:21, 90:17, 91:8, 91:20, 96:20,
97:24, 101:12, 109:3, 111:8, 115:3,
116:4, 116:9, 117:14, 118:5, 119:16,
119:18, 119:20, 119:23, 119:24, 120:2,
120:5, 120:6, 120:8, 120:11, 120:13,
120:14, 120:16, 120:19, 120:22, 120:25,
```

```
127:13. 127:17. 127:19. 129:14. 129:18.
129:19, 131:5, 131:6, 131:11, 132:21,
139:9, 145:15, 146:11, 146:12, 153:22,
161:1, 172:14, 172:25, 178:17, 178:25,
185:18, 187:22, 193:17, 195:20, 208:2,
209:3, 215:18, 219:12, 219:25, 220:2,
223:21, 230:20, 232:20, 237:3, 244:2,
248:9, 249:5, 267:13, 285:23, 286:11,
298:11, 303:23, 310:5
 differently [1] - 159:20
 difficult [2] - 23:19, 77:7
 difficulties [1] - 273:22
 digits [1] - 173:9
 dinner [2] - 78:25, 213:6
 dire [1] - 113:25
 direct [11] - 6:18, 155:6, 177:5, 178:2,
180:8, 181:10, 185:21, 194:9, 235:6,
272:18, 281:4
 DIRECT [3] - 135:19, 210:16, 281:21
 directed [3] - 13:18, 119:11, 310:8
 direction [2] - 120:2, 120:3
 directly [5] - 174:6, 192:24, 231:2,
248:18, 323:7
 director [6] - 18:2, 19:12, 22:5, 143:2,
 disagree [5] - 8:23, 48:18, 48:20, 49:7,
79:12
 disagreed [1] - 160:8
 disagreeing [1] - 192:5
 disagreement [4] - 7:8, 8:13, 313:23,
321:25
 disclosed [9] - 121:10, 192:21, 193:9,
307:4, 308:11, 309:10, 313:21, 314:7,
314:11
 disclosure [2] - 310:18, 311:12
 disclosures [1] - 313:22
 discovered [3] - 96:7, 296:25, 315:11
 discuss [14] - 10:10, 77:13, 77:14,
77:16, 77:19, 77:22, 78:15, 78:20,
78:24, 93:9, 114:20, 117:1, 134:16,
301:20
 discussed [2] - 62:23, 268:5
 discussing [2] - 191:3, 193:18
 discussion [5] - 14:5, 89:8, 130:10,
301:22, 309:5
 displays [1] - 251:8
 dispute [10] - 46:3, 56:4, 56:5, 56:7,
56:9, 79:13, 226:17, 312:22, 315:2,
 disputed [2] - 49:22, 90:20
 disputes [4] - 39:2, 48:2, 48:3, 48:4
 disqualifier [1] - 66:1
 dissemination [1] - 176:12
 distasteful [1] - 39:7
 distribute [1] - 79:17
 distributed [3] - 79:20, 185:17, 302:24
 distribution [3] - 16:22, 185:7, 185:9
 District [4] - 11:12, 11:13, 266:19,
266:20
 divide [1] - 113:20
```

121:1, 121:2, 121:5, 121:21, 126:25,

divided [2] - 158:6, 175:14 divides [1] - 178:8 dividing [2] - 178:5, 178:13 division [5] - 51:19, 178:20, 217:25, 254:14, 265:10 Division [2] - 266:20, 275:17 divisions [4] - 214:21, 215:4, 215:12, 215:19 divorcee [1] - 16:8 docket [1] - 252:9 doctor[1] - 16:20 doctorate [1] - 137:1 document [30] - 102:19, 102:20, 103:11, 103:12, 104:14, 104:19, 104:21, 119:2, 148:8, 148:21, 148:22, 148:25, 173:22, 189:9, 193:13, 194:7, 197:3, 198:20, 198:25, 199:4, 199:8, 199:9, 199:17, 199:20, 200:11, 200:13, 258:23, 259:4, 259:17 documentation [2] - 205:4, 249:18 documented [1] - 123:7 documents [13] - 74:16, 76:25, 102:6, 102:7, 103:21, 104:11, 108:9, 160:23, 189:3, 189:6, 199:11, 204:6 dollar [4] - 105:15, 106:8, 240:23 dollars [5] - 55:2, 109:19, 113:8, 221:22, 225:11 dollars' [1] - 223:3 Don [1] - 22:23 done [32] - 33:22, 44:25, 47:13, 59:8, 59:9, 84:20, 100:10, 113:6, 115:22, 118:17, 121:8, 142:21, 155:21, 170:17, 189:24, 193:7, 198:13, 199:9, 206:4, 217:18, 220:23, 232:19, 232:20, 236:1, 257:2, 268:24, 286:7, 286:9, 304:25, 305:3, 305:6, 320:13 door [1] - 299:25 dot [2] - 144:22, 284:13 dot-com [2] - 144:22, 284:13 dots [1] - 299:22 double [2] - 106:6, 214:4 doubt [1] - 92:4 Dover [2] - 170:2, 171:17 Down [1] - 213:1 down [23] - 20:9, 36:5, 59:5, 70:18, 82:8, 96:6, 108:4, 164:21, 164:23, 164:25, 165:1, 165:20, 176:9, 182:9, 185:11, 187:15, 189:22, 192:12, 194:11, 218:11, 234:16, 316:15, 316:16 downtown [1] - 26:20 dozen [3] - 251:14, 284:11, 286:17 dozens [1] - 285:22 **DPS** [1] - 20:8 **Dr** [138] - 9:2, 28:17, 102:4, 102:18, 102:22, 103:2, 103:9, 103:11, 103:21, 104:5, 104:6, 104:10, 104:24, 105:8,

105:10, 105:13, 106:12, 106:18, 107:9,

107:10, 107:25, 108:22, 108:23, 109:13,

109:16, 109:20, 109:22, 111:2, 111:4,

118:1, 118:18, 118:20, 122:11, 122:22,

123:9, 123:18, 123:19, 123:20, 123:22, 124:4, 124:18, 125:18, 126:6, 126:10, 126:13, 126:17, 127:25, 128:13, 128:15, 129:9, 130:1, 130:4, 131:2, 135:22, 135:25, 136:5, 136:8, 137:3, 138:2, 138:11, 140:23, 145:10, 146:2, 147:21, 148:2, 148:9, 148:21, 149:2, 149:13, 150:9, 151:21, 153:16, 153:23, 154:11, 155:3, 155:10, 158:25, 165:13, 168:20, 210:19, 210:24, 211:4, 211:8, 211:23, 212:2, 212:11, 212:17, 213:8, 214:13, 214:19, 215:22, 216:4, 218:7, 222:23, 223:5, 226:8, 227:1, 228:9, 229:5, 230:6, 232:2, 234:22, 235:9, 238:19, 239:17, 241:21, 242:9, 262:13, 291:4, 291:10, 298:9, 300:1, 303:8, 303:19, 305:22, 306:7, 308:21, 309:10, 309:18, 310:4, 310:21, 312:21, 313:20, 314:8, 314:18, 315:2, 315:20, 316:6, 316:7, 317:6, 318:2, 319:18, 320:17, 321:18 draft [6] - 8:3, 8:11, 174:17, 202:10, 306:25, 316:15 drafts [2] - 202:6, 202:7 draw [2] - 75:11, 76:16 drawing [1] - 111:2 drawings [1] - 242:6 drawn [1] - 173:21 draws [1] - 112:13 drive [4] - 115:25, 146:13, 185:21, 284:2 driver [2] - 17:14, 21:9 driving [2] - 229:19, 229:20 dropped [2] - 291:12, 297:13 dropping [1] - 211:22 DTX [4] - 5:18, 5:19, 300:4, 300:11 due [3] - 100:3, 113:5, 229:15 Duncan [3] - 21:19, 21:21, 33:1 during [26] - 75:14, 76:8, 76:18, 76:20, 77:1, 77:4, 77:5, 77:20, 77:25, 78:22, 78:23, 81:23, 83:20, 89:24, 98:25, 113:25, 118:15, 150:5, 167:5, 167:11, 169:24, 169:25, 225:5, 236:18 duties [1] - 213:20 duty [2] - 46:1, 76:13 dye [1] - 102:16 **DYK** [1] - 6:2 **Dyk** [5] - 11:14, 14:4, 36:1, 47:23, 101:2

Ε

e-mail [19] - 141:20, 141:21, 217:17,

dyne [1] - 214:16

235:20, 238:22, 248:13, 248:14, 248:22, 255:13, 274:16, 277:22, 278:11, 278:17, 279:5, 279:7, 279:14, 279:20, 312:9

e-mails [5] - 78:20, 189:4, 202:20, 280:2, 289:10

eager [1] - 248:8

ear [1] - 121:4

early [8] - 23:24, 128:11, 141:21, 142:7,

early-stage [1] - 216:8 ease [1] - 89:15 easily [1] - 229:1 East [3] - 20:25, 44:17, 44:21 Eastern [2] - 11:12, 266:20 easy [1] - 254:22 economic [2] - 52:9, 52:10 economist [1] - 104:6 economy [1] - 115:15 Ed [1] - 17:21 edited [1] - 169:2 editor [1] - 59:7 educated [1] - 118:6 education [4] - 22:25, 113:18, 169:20, educational [1] - 211:14 educator [1] - 18:12 **EE** [2] - 169:16, 169:18 effect [1] - 167:24 effective [5] - 148:14, 321:18, 321:24, 322:4, 322:21 effectively [2] - 108:4, 229:16 effects [1] - 70:15 efficiency [1] - 221:10 effort [6] - 92:11, 157:13, 163:15, 221:4, 222:12, 223:8 efforts [1] - 286:20 eight [8] - 12:17, 12:18, 12:22, 21:3, 63:15, 69:18, 71:3, 244:20 **Einstein's** [4] - 211:11, 211:13, 211:17, 243:24 either [26] - 10:10, 25:2, 26:2, 26:3, 55:19, 61:4, 69:5, 75:16, 78:6, 107:21, 147:2, 169:24, 184:5, 201:2, 204:9, 207:11, 220:17, 225:3, 227:18, 242:15, 254:18, 263:11, 267:21, 309:18, 310:22, 314:14 elder [1] - 21:16 electrical [8] - 103:3, 103:4, 122:20, 143:20, 185:20, 212:9, 212:15, 283:8 electronic [4] - 78:21, 79:3, 96:12, 170:6 **electronics** [1] - 143:19 **element** [10] - 103:23, 103:24, 107:23, 176:1, 291:7, 304:1, 311:1, 311:2 elementary [1] - 21:21 elements [15] - 48:10, 48:16, 48:19, 100:15, 100:22, 101:13, 101:24, 107:16, 107:20, 110:14, 264:18, 303:18, 310:20, 310:24 elicit [1] - 9:16 elsewhere [1] - 45:1 embodiment [2] - 264:13 emphasize [2] - 12:2, 92:8 emphasized [1] - 255:8 Empirix [4] - 215:13, 215:14, 215:16, 215:22 employed [4] - 15:21, 16:4, 137:3,

146:17, 187:18, 188:20, 216:8

```
employee [3] - 22:17, 144:11, 266:11
 employees [2] - 137:23, 284:11
 employer [2] - 57:5, 57:23
 employment [2] - 169:22, 169:23
 empty [1] - 22:20
 EMT [1] - 23:12
 enclosed [1] - 270:13
 encode [1] - 194:20
 encountered [1] - 197:7
 encumbrance [1] - 248:15
 end [31] - 7:12, 8:4, 29:3, 31:1, 72:23,
75:7, 76:22, 77:21, 77:23, 81:13, 81:14,
81:15, 82:6, 82:9, 84:23, 84:25, 89:17,
112:25, 149:17, 170:14, 171:12, 171:13,
186:24, 190:20, 213:9, 218:18, 234:5,
238:24, 284:24, 289:11, 314:4
 endeavor [1] - 46:5
 ended [4] - 126:25, 193:5, 226:10,
257:15
 ends [2] - 194:10, 272:5
 enforce [1] - 83:23
 enforcement [2] - 227:11, 227:15
 engages [1] - 267:11
 engine [2] - 124:8, 223:12
 engineer [5] - 21:22, 174:21, 213:21,
274:1, 274:8
 engineering [11] - 103:3, 103:4,
136:15, 137:2, 143:20, 185:16, 211:15,
212:9, 212:16, 222:21, 283:8
 engineers [6] - 114:14, 115:23, 125:4,
274:3, 274:7, 286:17
 engines [1] - 223:12
 England [2] - 108:22, 118:3
 English [1] - 120:12
 enhanced [1] - 251:8
 enjoy [1] - 118:2
 enjoyed [1] - 133:4
 enormous [2] - 97:25, 222:4
 enter [2] - 70:11, 277:14
 entered [2] - 105:3, 161:24
 entertain [1] - 302:10
 enthusiastically [1] - 102:2
 entire [7] - 96:5, 141:22, 206:18,
207:18, 220:19, 271:1, 278:15
 entirely [2] - 192:25, 199:5
 entities [1] - 220:24
 entitled [6] - 39:8, 86:22, 87:2, 119:3,
204:8, 239:19
 entity [2] - 50:17, 231:20
 equation [1] - 176:24
 equations [2] - 177:20, 201:9
 Equipment [1] - 195:14
 equipment [3] - 141:3, 175:10, 198:12
 equivalents [1] - 264:11
 Eric [5] - 6:12, 26:19, 29:18, 45:6,
 error [10] - 25:22, 94:13, 94:24, 97:8,
98:16, 103:7, 152:16, 179:23, 304:24
 errors [3] - 95:21, 98:22, 99:7
 escalated [1] - 289:8
```

```
ESPN [1] - 223:25
 essence [2] - 274:17, 297:17
 essentially [5] - 139:24, 140:20,
142:11, 147:13, 170:18
 et [1] - 289:10
 Ethernet [2] - 187:8, 197:15
 ethics [1] - 66:8
 ETMC [1] - 22:15
 evaluate [3] - 215:5, 272:15, 273:3
 evaluation [5] - 246:6, 252:14, 273:5,
276:1, 277:7
 evenly [1] - 91:15
 event [2] - 188:25, 190:23
 events [1] - 99:12
 eventually [8] - 215:18, 217:20, 219:6,
229:14, 230:12, 237:21, 292:16, 299:17
 everyday [2] - 97:1, 98:1
 evidence [73] - 9:9, 29:2, 35:17, 35:20,
35:25, 36:7, 36:9, 49:24, 50:3, 50:6,
72:24, 73:6, 73:11, 74:3, 74:6, 74:7,
74:8, 74:12, 74:17, 74:22, 74:24, 75:2,
75:3, 75:4, 75:5, 75:8, 75:10, 75:15,
75:17, 75:21, 76:1, 76:5, 76:6, 76:7,
76:16, 76:21, 76:24, 79:14, 87:9, 87:12,
87:13, 90:24, 91:6, 91:12, 91:14, 91:16,
91:19, 91:22, 91:24, 91:25, 92:2, 92:3,
92:7, 108:8, 113:21, 114:11, 133:9,
133:19, 133:22, 135:5, 293:17, 293:21,
295:24, 299:9, 299:20, 306:4, 313:22,
314:6, 316:12
 evolution [2] - 117:1, 159:5
 evolve [1] - 156:7
 ex [1] - 85:22
 exact [6] - 65:11, 84:20, 95:21, 117:22,
173:3, 251:13
 exactly [13] - 62:21, 74:15, 100:12,
109:5, 109:12, 171:9, 185:25, 258:17,
266:23, 269:8, 291:17, 311:13, 314:23
 examination [4] - 9:6, 281:4, 301:13,
318:11
 EXAMINATION [7] - 135:19, 155:1,
165:11, 210:16, 243:6, 262:11, 281:21
 examined [1] - 322:10
 examiner [11] - 49:18, 57:14, 83:9,
85:15, 85:17, 85:22, 85:25, 86:16,
86:19, 202:18, 202:21
 examiners [2] - 84:14, 85:13
 example [15] - 10:21, 30:14, 98:2,
142:8, 198:3, 200:22, 204:5, 220:20,
220:21, 222:9, 231:3, 250:17, 283:24,
299:5, 308:9
 examples [1] - 103:14
 excelled [1] - 58:7
 except [4] - 78:9, 204:3, 205:11, 302:18
 exception [1] - 93:11
 exceptional [1] - 78:9
 excess [1] - 221:21
 exchange [2] - 289:13, 312:9
 Exchange [2] - 138:1, 213:15
 exchanges [1] - 238:22
```

```
exciting [1] - 136:17
 exclude [1] - 89:24
 excluded [7] - 75:9, 75:24, 303:22,
303:24, 307:16, 307:17, 311:19
 exclusively [1] - 283:11
 excursion [1] - 136:22
 excuse [19] - 25:2, 25:8, 51:12, 53:6,
54:8, 64:6, 65:17, 66:25, 67:5, 107:16,
149:3, 200:6, 238:19, 265:20, 266:1,
292:13, 299:7, 305:7, 305:24
 excused [11] - 12:7, 64:13, 69:3, 69:4,
71:6, 168:16, 168:18, 168:21, 265:24,
266:6, 301:16
 excuses [3] - 68:11, 108:1
 execute [1] - 176:1
 execution [2] - 139:11, 151:19
 executives [1] - 139:13
 Exhibit [61] - 4:3, 4:4, 4:5, 4:6, 4:7, 4:8,
4:9, 4:10, 4:11, 4:12, 4:13, 4:14, 4:15,
4:16, 4:17, 4:19, 4:20, 4:21, 4:22, 5:16,
5:17, 148:5, 148:19, 149:11, 150:8,
150:18, 152:9, 153:24, 162:22, 173:7,
173:14, 188:24, 193:12, 193:19, 193:21,
194:3, 198:21, 199:17, 206:16, 230:7,
230:8, 230:13, 230:14, 231:24, 234:10,
235:15, 239:2, 254:16, 255:23, 258:21,
263:7, 269:10, 278:12, 280:20, 294:19,
296:4, 302:16, 312:10
 exhibit [6] - 75:6, 171:15, 250:13,
271:3, 271:5, 271:6
 EXHIBITS [1] - 4:1
 exhibits [12] - 74:11, 74:16, 76:24,
76:25, 163:1, 163:2, 292:23, 300:4,
302:13, 302:15, 304:6, 321:13
 existed [2] - 85:10, 142:14
 existence [1] - 198:4
 existing [6] - 84:3, 220:15, 237:4,
237:11, 237:19, 313:21
 exit [2] - 25:11, 72:10
 expanded [1] - 148:23
 expect [8] - 107:11, 113:17, 166:15,
172:1, 198:11, 256:20, 274:25, 275:8
 expectation [3] - 166:18, 172:7, 276:23
 expectations [1] - 188:2
 expected [3] - 105:7, 112:3, 293:12
 expecting [2] - 105:9, 282:16
 expects [1] - 49:24
 expensive [4] - 22:9, 227:5, 227:15,
 experience [15] - 54:24, 55:9, 102:23,
104:13, 140:23, 141:1, 143:5, 225:2,
225:6, 226:9, 226:21, 249:15, 297:25,
 experiences [4] - 30:12, 30:19, 53:15,
53:18
 expert [46] - 83:10, 93:11, 102:3, 104:4,
104:5, 104:6, 104:8, 104:9, 110:10,
111:17, 226:10, 226:12, 226:20, 227:2,
243:16, 244:2, 244:13, 245:1, 263:2,
```

277:1, 277:7, 277:12, 291:4, 305:18,

306:14, 307:4, 307:13, 307:16, 307:24, 308:5, 308:12, 308:17, 308:20, 309:13, 309:14, 309:15, 311:5, 311:15, 311:24, 312:25, 313:2, 313:8, 315:20, 316:11, 320:12 expert's [1] - 307:12

expertise [4] - 245:13, 284:23, 297:25, 298:3

experts [10] - 90:23, 108:22, 277:4, 299:25, 307:23, 311:24, 312:23, 313:18, 321:3, 323:8

explain [13] - 73:22, 79:19, 81:11, 88:24, 118:19, 122:14, 122:15, 134:5, 152:2, 154:4, 176:16, 195:5, 220:4

 $\pmb{\text{explained}}\ {\tiny [2]}\ -\ 303{:}18,\ 304{:}5$

explaining [1] - 292:12

explains [1] - 114:11

explanation [3] - 279:24, 280:2, 311:5

explicit [2] - 175:5, 185:1

explicitly [1] - 185:5

explore [1] - 211:22

express [1] - 231:20

 $\pmb{\text{expressed}}\ {}_{[5]}\ \text{-}\ 168:7,\ 236:20,\ 241:11,}$

257:9, 258:3

extend [1] - 11:13

extending [1] - 309:5

extent [7] - 169:20, 311:22, 312:2,

314:4, 316:9, 322:24, 323:13

external [1] - 220:18

externally [1] - 184:6

extra [1] - 105:18

extract [3] - 187:20, 194:21, 261:16 **extremely** [4] - 70:24, 96:4, 110:13,

185:2

eye [1] - 16:20

eyes [1] - 58:18

F

fabric [1] - 175:3 **face** [1] - 115:5

Facebook [2] - 78:15, 284:3

faceless [1] - 115:21

fact [42] - 46:24, 50:3, 62:3, 65:19, 66:4, 74:18, 74:20, 75:22, 76:20, 77:19, 79:5, 86:22, 86:23, 103:5, 104:7, 107:15, 107:16, 111:22, 112:14, 113:5, 115:16, 126:6, 131:20, 146:21, 158:13, 183:9, 192:8, 201:3, 223:21, 225:19, 241:21, 245:24, 248:16, 256:3, 261:15, 275:4, 290:19, 293:15, 304:11, 309:10, 319:13, 319:14

Factor [1] - 303:20 factors [1] - 303:20

factory [1] - 20:10

facts [6] - 40:25, 72:24, 73:2, 75:11, 75:19, 226:16

factual [4] - 46:2, 49:14, 50:7, 152:13 **fair** [13] - 13:21, 14:13, 30:10, 30:22,

fair [13] - 13:21, 14:13, 30:10, 30:22, 46:18, 46:23, 61:15, 62:5, 63:1, 161:24,

174:6, 310:1, 322:15

fairly [4] - 92:12, 109:2, 139:2, 176:20

fairness [1] - 61:21

faith [2] - 268:7, 289:17

fall [1] - 230:3

falling [1] - 194:16

 $\textbf{familiar}\, {\small [6]} - 6{\small :}21,\, 34{\small :}5,\, 50{\small :}21,\, 147{\small :}2,\\$

161:8, 258:25

families [2] - 298:11, 298:25

family [23] - 15:9, 17:17, 19:13, 24:20, 36:18, 44:20, 56:4, 56:17, 56:22, 58:24, 77:14, 78:18, 78:24, 118:4, 136:2,

77:14, 78:18, 78:24, 118:4, 136:2, 136:10, 151:1, 173:11, 210:23, 240:21,

282:22, 283:1, 287:24 **far** [8] - 53:4, 172:6, 172:16, 188:17,

192:18, 224:2, 301:25, 302:24 **farm** [2] - 18:15, 18:21

fashion [1] - 177:21

fast [6] - 94:12, 98:16, 100:1, 147:12,

153:20, 164:17

fast-forward [1] - 100:1

 $\pmb{\text{faster}}\, {}_{[4]} - 97{:}8,\, 99{:}7,\, 142{:}13,\, 206{:}12$

father [3] - 31:15, 51:18, 283:1

favor [4] - 39:11, 55:25, 66:6, 75:20

favorite [1] - 15:23

favors [1] - 91:16

feature [5] - 236:14, 268:16, 304:16,

305:14, 305:21

features [15] - 104:20, 104:21, 116:5, 198:24, 207:19, 268:11, 303:23, 304:2, 304:3, 304:7, 304:11, 304:15, 305:1,

305:2, 305:19

February [1] - 143:22

federal [4] - 12:6, 47:22, 83:24, 87:1 **fee** [6] - 154:5, 203:2, 203:4, 229:15,

229:22, 289:23

feedback [5] - 110:18, 110:20, 111:7, 111:8, 111:11

feeds [2] - 54:13, 176:3

feelings [1] - 36:25

fees [5] - 229:15, 241:1, 246:23,

284:20, 284:22

fellow [8] - 77:20, 77:22, 108:22, 141:18, 145:21, 145:24, 275:25, 278:1

fellowship [1] - 18:1

felt [4] - 164:12, 226:21, 227:12, 248:3

Ferguson [4] - 11:23, 72:12, 79:17,

302:19

fetch [1] - 175:25

fetches [1] - 176:2

few [25] - 6:6, 13:14, 23:17, 35:7, 43:18, 64:4, 82:24, 84:16, 142:8, 146:18, 155:25, 162:1, 170:6, 235:10, 238:20, 245:4, 249:23, 251:18, 257:16, 300:8, 300:10, 302:1, 302:9, 312:7, 324:10

field [6] - 17:14, 83:10, 145:20, 252:15, 261:2, 311:23

Figure [15] - 117:22, 175:1, 176:15, 178:23, 179:1, 180:16, 181:19, 182:3, 182:14, 185:7, 206:17, 206:18, 207:15,

207:16. 208:24

figure [20] - 109:1, 117:8, 117:21, 122:1, 124:16, 175:1, 175:4, 175:14, 176:16, 182:6, 182:7, 206:24, 208:3, 219:4, 222:12, 231:2, 252:18, 260:3, 306:9, 320:14

figured [1] - 292:9

figures [8] - 89:10, 89:13, 119:9,

173:16, 173:18, 185:5, 295:23

figuring [1] - 222:14

file [6] - 56:16, 223:17, 248:2, 248:6, 248:11, 253:11

filed [24] - 6:8, 37:22, 37:23, 56:17, 57:1, 57:6, 99:16, 99:19, 99:23, 193:6, 193:16, 201:25, 202:5, 246:7, 246:9, 246:12, 250:7, 254:2, 266:19, 292:12, 302:17, 307:7, 312:15, 321:9

files [11] - 83:8, 84:13, 176:8, 207:4, 207:7, 207:10, 223:16, 223:18, 246:19,

269:11

filing [8] - 37:24, 202:5, 202:10, 202:19, 248:23, 297:15, 297:16, 306:21

film [7] - 21:4, 48:7, 48:8, 48:13, 49:3, 49:11

Final [1] - 302:16

final [27] - 7:2, 8:2, 8:6, 8:11, 8:18, 8:22, 12:20, 13:6, 14:9, 49:21, 59:3, 59:4, 59:5, 59:16, 61:11, 63:14, 73:12, 92:8, 102:17, 104:2, 119:5, 133:14, 134:18, 191:15, 307:1, 316:25, 317:1

finally [2] - 12:19, 291:25

finance [1] - 191:4

financial [5] - 17:23, 24:19, 154:1, 240:15, 242:11

fine [5] - 6:14, 39:7, 125:15, 168:19, 320:18

finish [1] - 13:11

finished [4] - 136:23, 156:4, 156:9, 213:12

finishing [1] - 171:11

fire [1] - 47:22

firm [12] - 23:11, 34:10, 34:11, 34:15, 34:17, 34:20, 34:21, 64:24, 91:25, 284:8, 284:9, 285:4

firmly [1] - 66:17

firms [6] - 137:22, 217:9, 218:24, 243:17, 244:1, 244:15

First [3] - 271:22, 302:16, 302:17
first [93] - 6:7, 9:17, 12:15, 23:18, 35:3, 35:24, 46:6, 47:9, 48:5, 59:19, 64:2, 65:6, 73:4, 73:8, 73:24, 80:10, 86:7, 89:1, 89:10, 91:9, 93:18, 93:22, 94:13, 96:21, 97:6, 97:13, 107:6, 107:8, 107:15, 107:19, 108:11, 108:15, 110:14,

110:15, 113:23, 114:16, 116:12, 116:17, 118:22, 118:23, 119:2, 121:11, 122:5, 123:21, 124:25, 125:25, 128:9, 131:16

123:21, 124:25, 125:25, 128:9, 131:16, 132:13, 132:14, 135:5, 136:10, 139:10,

139:20, 141:4, 141:5, 141:8, 141:20, 143:15, 147:22, 147:23, 148:5, 159:23,

169:11, 169:23, 174:2, 175:1, 179:9,

186:18, 193:24, 206:14, 208:6, 217:16, 217:17, 220:7, 225:1, 228:14, 228:16, 228:24, 232:12, 262:15, 268:25, 271:3, 271:21, 287:12, 291:22, 292:3, 293:9, 302:12, 304:1, 312:8 fish [3] - 16:10, 20:11, 30:1 **five** [10] - 15:14, 15:17, 18:3, 55:1, 63:17, 63:22, 67:25, 229:22, 265:8, 286:3 fix [4] - 43:24, 179:16, 179:19, 179:24 fixed [4] - 177:23, 201:10, 201:12, 219:3 flags [1] - 194:12 flexibility [1] - 99:5 flexible [4] - 94:12, 97:8, 98:16, 153:21 flip [5] - 38:22, 149:17, 176:15, 207:15, 300:7 Flit [6] - 130:20, 131:3, 131:4, 131:20, 131:21, 132:3 Flits [3] - 130:24, 130:25, 131:6 Florida [1] - 283:7 flow [5] - 130:24, 151:16, 151:18, 190:22, 259:3 fly [1] - 132:22 focus [7] - 88:23, 89:19, 89:21, 100:17, 118:15, 196:25, 208:6 focused [2] - 124:20, 216:8 focusing [1] - 208:19 **folks** [20] - 36:13, 36:23, 36:24, 36:25, 43:21, 43:23, 101:4, 104:8, 110:19, 113:6, 118:12, 125:3, 125:15, 125:21, 126:16, 130:16, 219:15, 219:20, 227:20, 272:22 follow [6] - 73:1, 82:24, 87:13, 92:16, 229:1, 256:14 follow-up [1] - 82:24 following [6] - 37:5, 38:18, 44:3, 81:4, 264:8, 309:9 follows [1] - 13:1 football [2] - 30:3, 35:18 for-cause [1] - 67:3 force [2] - 229:19, 229:20 Force [1] - 140:8 Forces [1] - 283:2 FOREGOING [1] - 324:15 foreign [4] - 290:7, 290:10, 290:13, 297:3 foremost [2] - 107:8, 139:10 forever [2] - 295:14, 296:15 forget [3] - 195:15, 196:19, 269:7 forgotten [4] - 196:20, 196:23, 266:3, 275:24 **form** [6] - 9:6, 53:23, 183:6, 184:5, 285:4, 285:7 formal [4] - 8:9, 169:20, 191:8, 241:7 format [4] - 195:20, 195:21, 195:23, 200:16

formats [2] - 199:21, 199:23

275:8, 285:8

formed [5] - 46:17, 219:13, 231:11,

former [6] - 21:2, 42:14, 42:15, 57:5, 109:18, 215:23 forms [1] - 266:4 **Fort** [2] - 26:22, 26:23 **forth** [13] - 85:25, 86:3, 89:11, 95:20, 97:18, 98:8, 98:20, 129:23, 202:13, 289:4, 289:6, 323:17, 323:22 **fortune** [1] - 136:19 forward [6] - 11:18, 12:14, 82:10, 100:1, 134:11, 246:24 Forward [1] - 259:14 **Foundation** [1] - 140:10 foundation [2] - 152:21, 153:11 founded [4] - 137:11, 137:12, 137:13, 214:2 founding [2] - 141:17, 284:10 four [29] - 21:2, 56:9, 100:6, 100:14, 101:24, 109:5, 109:6, 109:9, 110:9, 110:22, 127:7, 127:9, 141:8, 173:16, 194:16, 194:19, 194:25, 203:20, 203:21, 204:1, 208:2, 218:21, 229:22, 250:25, 255:7, 271:13, 282:14, 286:16, 286:19 four-month [1] - 56:9 fourth [1] - 103:18 frame [5] - 146:23, 189:23, 236:19, 289:3, 291:19 framed [1] - 9:15 frankly [3] - 46:1, 66:3, 310:20 free [9] - 15:8, 16:6, 17:17, 18:2, 18:20, 19:5, 20:20, 72:9, 152:6 Freescale [22] - 261:24, 292:4, 292:7, 292:10, 292:17, 292:20, 293:5, 293:8, 293:10, 293:18, 294:21, 295:9, 295:10, 295:13, 296:17, 297:1, 297:5, 320:3, 321:14, 321:15, 323:5, 323:13 French [1] - 120:11 Friday [3] - 23:21, 73:16, 306:24 Fried [1] - 20:20 $\pmb{\text{friend}}\, [6] - 36:18,\, 44:20,\, 51:7,\, 51:25,\,$ 57:13, 94:6 friends [4] - 56:22, 58:24, 77:15, 78:17 FROM [1] - 324:15 front [13] - 50:2, 76:15, 89:7, 149:12, 157:10, 162:22, 240:19, 240:20, 266:24, 284:21, 284:22, 289:23, 290:2 full [5] - 84:20, 99:20, 114:12, 178:7, 202:10 fully [2] - 116:22, 319:24 fun [1] - 215:10 function [7] - 49:13, 176:20, 177:1, 195:4, 195:7, 195:8, 197:8 functional [4] - 185:12, 191:24, 208:3, 209:2 functionality [4] - 146:11, 190:1, 192:2, fundamental [1] - 321:25 fundamentally [2] - 36:11, 314:10 funding [1] - 191:2 funds [3] - 32:5, 32:6, 65:11 fuss [2] - 107:20, 107:22 Future [1] - 259:18 future [8] - 105:7, 105:9, 106:22, 112:3, 247:15, 274:22, 294:22, 295:10

G

games [1] - 30:4 gaps [1] - 215:21 Gardner [1] - 34:14 gates [1] - 192:12 gather [1] - 299:24 Gavin [3] - 28:11, 108:23, 118:1 gender [1] - 65:1 General [1] - 137:14 general [21] - 13:17, 20:25, 28:23, 35:12, 78:2, 85:9, 112:13, 189:23, 191:1, 206:12, 207:5, 207:6, 212:25, 219:18, 232:11, 267:9, 268:2, 268:9, 269:12, 269:15, 307:8 generally [22] - 6:14, 6:21, 142:18, 173:5, 174:19, 175:9, 175:19, 175:24, 176:1, 176:11, 176:19, 177:20, 178:5, 179:5, 197:17, 206:8, 206:9, 232:13, 262:20, 294:2, 295:16, 308:20 generated [5] - 86:2, 154:7, 233:22, 241:1. 242:3 **generating** [1] - 234:6 generator [2] - 130:22, 178:9 Generator [3] - 130:25, 131:4, 131:5 generators [1] - 131:5 generic [1] - 232:5 gentleman [11] - 28:3, 28:5, 28:6, 28:7, 28:8, 28:16, 34:11, 116:24, 116:25, 277:23 gentlemen [44] - 11:11, 35:5, 38:9, 44:16, 45:5, 45:16, 70:14, 94:9, 94:17, 98:15, 98:18, 99:1, 99:8, 100:21, 101:9, 101:19, 102:1, 103:21, 104:3, 104:15, 105:21, 106:20, 107:14, 108:13, 108:21, 109:4, 109:7, 110:3, 111:12, 111:20, 112:4, 112:10, 112:19, 112:25, 132:16, 139:16, 146:18, 151:11, 153:17, 211:12, 220:5, 228:10, 232:3, 241:14 Georgia [2] - 303:20, 304:17 Georgia-Pacific [2] - 303:20, 304:17 German [1] - 120:12 Gibbs [8] - 17:13, 17:14, 33:8, 33:9, 44:10, 57:2, 58:9 qiqabit [2] - 142:11, 142:15 gigabits [1] - 142:17 gigabytes [1] - 142:16 girl [2] - 17:16, 282:16 girls [4] - 21:13, 21:14, 211:1 gist [1] - 208:25 given [7] - 25:25, 77:11, 90:14, 90:22,

functions [9] - 116:4, 180:5, 194:20,

194:25, 198:4, 201:18, 205:9, 206:6,

fund [8] - 31:7, 31:17, 31:20, 64:22,

65:2, 65:19, 66:17, 66:19

268:19

206:10

92:22. 93:10. 172:21 globe [1] - 126:22 Gloria [2] - 18:8, 20:14 glossary [1] - 81:1 Glossary [1] - 81:1 goal [2] - 217:8, 217:10 God [2] - 188:4, 188:6 Google [2] - 128:22, 300:9 Gordon [1] - 286:2 gotcha [1] - 320:12 Government [1] - 139:21 government [4] - 139:25, 140:17, 222:19, 227:14 governmental [3] - 140:5, 140:14, 147:25 governs [1] - 72:17 grade [1] - 29:25 graduate [4] - 137:13, 212:11, 212:12, 212:14 graduated [2] - 170:5, 284:9 graduates [1] - 145:11 graduation [1] - 169:17 grammar [1] - 120:13 grandchildren [2] - 18:3, 45:20 granted [15] - 57:7, 83:5, 83:12, 84:8, 85:20, 86:2, 86:4, 86:6, 86:8, 94:18, 167:20, 237:5, 283:17, 298:17, 298:19 granting [1] - 86:11 graphic [2] - 22:18, 121:9 grateful [2] - 70:24 great [13] - 34:8, 35:2, 45:12, 92:11, 136:19, 143:22, 156:20, 192:24, 197:13, 232:19, 287:15, 297:24 Green [4] - 19:11, 22:16, 34:1, 283:3 Greenville [1] - 51:21 Greenwald [3] - 272:19, 273:1, 275:13 grew [2] - 282:22, 282:25 gross [2] - 289:14, 321:24 **grounds** [3] - 25:3, 65:20, 87:5 group [13] - 97:19, 97:20, 97:23, 137:22, 218:23, 218:24, 220:23, 227:7, 231:11, 231:15, 232:6, 272:14 grouping [2] - 230:24, 251:5 groupings [2] - 251:2, 251:4 groups [4] - 151:12, 194:16, 194:19, 229:18 grow [6] - 216:10, 217:11, 219:6, 234:9, 240:8, 282:20 grown [3] - 19:4, 21:23, 141:25 GTE [3] - 137:25, 164:5, 164:6 guarantee [1] - 210:21 guess [8] - 14:23, 63:4, 68:15, 214:17, 251:7, 284:14, 285:15, 319:1 guidance [1] - 136:20 guided [1] - 79:10 guilty [3] - 43:14, 46:10, 46:15

Н

H&R [1] - 20:16 H-O-U-H [1] - 210:20 H3XL [2] - 243:24, 243:25 hair [2] - 218:11, 221:7 hairstylist [1] - 15:22 half [8] - 72:18, 113:8, 203:20, 203:21, 204:1, 214:11, 258:22, 286:17 Hall [1] - 137:15 halls [1] - 78:1 Hampshire [3] - 144:17, 170:2, 171:17 hand [30] - 32:21, 33:2, 33:3, 36:10, 37:4, 37:8, 44:6, 47:19, 57:24, 59:23, 60:22, 80:9, 80:14, 80:20, 82:10, 82:15, 84:2, 89:4, 91:16, 91:20, 117:20, 118:9, 127:6, 174:3, 174:21, 207:21, 252:22, 269:9, 275:12, 277:21 handed [5] - 148:2, 148:3, 193:12, 198:20. 287:11 handful [1] - 200:4 handle [3] - 76:11, 188:5, 303:1 handled [1] - 190:13 handling [1] - 318:11 hands [6] - 28:22, 29:6, 31:4, 35:8, 36:15, 115:9 handwriting [1] - 270:2 handwritten [2] - 269:20, 270:10 happily [1] - 282:12 happy [2] - 11:18, 174:20 hard [8] - 30:18, 34:19, 70:14, 101:1, 186:19, 250:4, 262:17, 282:21 hardship [6] - 23:18, 23:23, 23:24, 24:4, 25:3, 68:11 Hardware [1] - 149:16 hardware [33] - 25:21, 130:20, 131:23, 132:5, 142:2, 142:3, 142:4, 146:12, 152:16, 153:21, 176:22, 177:23, 185:16, 187:19, 192:1, 192:6, 192:9, 192:10, 192:11, 200:11, 200:13, 200:14, 200:16, 200:19, 200:21, 201:9, 201:15, 201:24, 206:11, 206:12, 214:23, 242:4 hardwired [22] - 94:15, 97:9, 97:11, 104:18. 152:19. 152:25. 166:21. 177:12. 177:15, 177:22, 183:4, 195:25, 196:2, 198:6, 198:13, 198:18, 201:1, 201:5, 201:7, 201:14, 201:19, 208:9 Harold [2] - 28:7, 102:4 Harry [2] - 28:17, 107:9 hay [2] - 320:5, 320:10 Hays [2] - 272:22, 275:14 **HAYTER** [1] - 266:15 Hayter [4] - 28:13, 266:11, 266:17, 267:4 head [5] - 21:1, 32:19, 60:25, 205:15, 265:10 headed [1] - 273:2 heading [4] - 177:7, 193:25, 198:25, 271:22

headlines [1] - 60:25 Health [1] - 20:15 hear [26] - 11:15, 30:7, 38:8, 38:13, 38:19, 74:3, 79:10, 83:19, 86:5, 102:11, 105:24, 109:22, 112:10, 112:14, 112:15, 116:9, 116:24, 121:3, 126:1, 133:19, 134:4, 201:14, 213:25, 245:6, 298:9, 322:18 heard [33] - 26:1, 50:11, 50:13, 50:15, 50:18, 53:21, 55:18, 55:22, 59:18, 59:20, 59:21, 60:2, 60:5, 60:10, 60:13, 60:23, 61:7, 72:25, 76:21, 76:24, 79:14, 101:14, 113:24, 116:15, 116:17, 116:20, 125:13, 129:9, 221:21, 222:3, 277:13, 287:16, 289:7 hearing [3] - 60:8, 76:9, 313:14 hedge [3] - 108:16, 108:20, 111:13 hedonic [2] - 304:4, 305:3 held [3] - 137:22, 232:18, 307:11 hello [1] - 19:15 **help** [24] - 11:17, 24:15, 46:3, 87:13, 102:23, 121:9, 127:5, 144:15, 147:16, 147:19, 171:24, 182:23, 216:9, 216:10, 217:11, 221:9, 223:10, 226:23, 231:2, 234:8, 257:12, 283:12, 284:23 helped [5] - 122:12, 172:10, 215:19, 224:3, 229:10 helpful [4] - 8:10, 15:2, 83:2, 324:6 helping [2] - 100:3, 119:21 helps [2] - 234:7, 257:14 Henderson [1] - 23:11 HENRY [3] - 210:16, 243:6, 262:11 Henry [5] - 28:8, 210:8, 210:20, 280:14, 287:9 HEREBY [1] - 324:14 herself [3] - 24:16, 85:18, 317:12 hesitate [2] - 44:4, 44:8 Hewlett [4] - 55:1, 56:6, 128:14, 130:14 Hewlett-Packard [4] - 55:1, 56:6, 128:14, 130:14 hi [2] - 15:4, 19:23 hid [2] - 252:15, 252:17 hidden [1] - 162:13 hides [1] - 244:7 high [24] - 58:4, 58:5, 92:3, 138:25, 147:6, 147:10, 149:20, 151:12, 152:13, 161:10, 166:14, 169:12, 186:24, 188:3, 188:5, 189:21, 191:20, 191:23, 197:14, 228:5, 228:21, 230:8, 252:3, 318:19 High [1] - 29:24 high-end [1] - 186:24 high-level [6] - 166:14, 189:21, 191:20, 191:23, 228:5, 228:21 high-speed [3] - 147:10, 188:5, 197:14 higher [5] - 36:8, 37:20, 91:23, 92:2, 197:18 highest [6] - 12:5, 95:13, 143:23, 145:22, 265:3, 265:4 highlight [3] - 116:11, 116:14, 124:15 highlighted [2] - 121:25, 123:3

highly [4] - 55:11, 104:6, 146:4, 157:2 hill [1] - 15:24 himself [1] - 33:24 hint [1] - 253:5 hinted [1] - 253:9 hire [2] - 277:1, 277:12 hired [4] - 170:23, 171:1, 277:3, 277:6 history [9] - 86:4, 86:5, 95:7, 113:24, 117:1, 137:20, 169:22, 214:23, 217:14 hobby [2] - 22:10, 22:11 Hoffman [9] - 23:7, 41:14, 44:12, 44:15, 46:7, 46:8, 47:6, 47:11, 47:14 **hold** [1] - 115:9 holder [3] - 83:13, 83:23, 91:9 holder's [1] - 43:6 holders [1] - 285:23 holding [3] - 118:9, 127:6, 206:16 holiday [2] - 273:22, 274:13 Hollie [1] - 18:18 home [3] - 29:22, 78:25, 96:13 Home [2] - 15:13, 15:14 homemaker [1] - 17:4 HON [1] - 6:2 honest [1] - 47:16 honor [3] - 95:13, 143:23, 253:15 Honor [140] - 6:12, 6:14, 7:4, 7:9, 7:18, 7:22, 8:16, 9:2, 9:13, 10:3, 10:8, 10:12, 10:13, 11:3, 11:4, 25:5, 25:6, 26:18, 27:3, 27:6, 28:1, 29:12, 30:9, 33:6, 35:14, 35:25, 45:15, 47:6, 63:10, 64:9, 64:11, 64:14, 64:19, 65:4, 65:6, 65:23, 67:5, 67:14, 67:15, 67:20, 67:23, 68:4, 68:16, 70:4, 70:7, 72:1, 72:2, 92:23, 92:24, 93:2, 93:16, 93:20, 96:22, 100:18, 101:2, 101:4, 110:13, 110:16, 114:17, 135:8, 135:12, 135:14, 153:3, 153:5, 153:10, 153:12, 154:17, 154:18, 165:9, 168:11, 168:18, 168:19, 168:25, 210:7, 210:9, 210:11, 210:14, 243:1, 261:5, 262:10, 263:9, 265:16, 265:18, 265:21, 265:22, 265:25, 266:7, 266:10, 266:12, 281:2, 281:7, 281:11, 281:13, 281:16, 293:14, 293:24, 294:16, 294:25, 295:5, 295:19, 296:2, 296:19, 301:10, 301:11, 301:14, 302:14, 303:14, 304:20, 304:23, 305:17, 305:24, 306:16, 306:18, 306:22, 307:19, 307:21, 308:15, 310:9, 310:13, 310:17, 312:7, 313:13, 315:6, 315:8, 315:11, 316:4, 316:21, 317:5, 317:19, 317:21, 317:25, 318:5, 318:12, 319:12, 319:17, 319:22, 320:9, 322:19, 323:9, 324:2 Honor's [1] - 312:13

honor-bound [1] - 253:15 hope [3] - 73:15, 100:10, 306:18 hoped [1] - 162:5 hopefully [2] - 113:18, 216:11 hoping [1] - 8:3

horizontally [1] - 176:8 horribly [1] - 318:5

horse [1] - 30:3 horseback [1] - 30:2 Hospital [1] - 20:18 hospital [3] - 24:9, 56:15, 282:16 Houh [46] - 28:8, 160:1, 162:17, 162:18, 210:8, 210:19, 210:20, 210:24, 211:4, 211:8, 211:23, 212:2, 212:11, 212:17, 213:8, 214:13, 214:19, 215:22, 216:4, 218:7, 222:23, 223:5, 226:8, 227:1, 228:9, 229:5, 230:6, 232:2, 234:15, 234:22, 235:9, 238:19, 239:17, 241:21, 242:9, 243:8, 261:12, 262:13, 265:23, 266:1, 278:6, 280:15, 287:9, 322:10 HOUH [3] - 210:16, 243:6, 262:11 hour [5] - 72:18, 72:20, 140:21, 203:18 hourly [2] - 203:15, 203:17 hours [9] - 55:1, 102:5, 155:25, 203:20, 203:21, 204:1, 276:3, 276:6, 276:10 house [5] - 43:24, 220:17, 222:8, 228:1, 286:18 House [2] - 144:7, 213:2 housewives [1] - 21:13 Houston [2] - 17:25, 18:14 Howell [1] - 162:16 HP [2] - 163:18, 231:6 HSN [1] - 55:10 Huawei [1] - 298:20 Human [1] - 20:15 hundred [10] - 48:22, 55:2, 62:4, 63:2, 63:6, 105:15, 157:21, 218:21, 240:23, 286:10 hundred-thousand-dollar [1] - 240:23 hundreds [5] - 102:4, 109:19, 157:14, 161:22, 285:24 $\pmb{\text{hundredth}}\ {\tiny [2]}\ \hbox{-}\ 111:21,\ 111:23$ hunt [1] - 30:1 Hurley [6] - 20:24, 37:12, 37:17, 51:13, 56:8, 59:10 hurting [1] - 30:18 husband [12] - 16:21, 16:23, 19:1, 19:11, 20:1, 20:3, 21:22, 22:5, 22:14, 22:16, 22:25, 24:8 husband's [7] - 17:22, 18:25, 19:9, 19:24, 21:20, 22:23 Hyannis [4] - 125:8, 315:17, 316:7, 316:12 hydraulic [1] - 16:13 Hydrogen [10] - 109:15, 111:3, 118:12,

ı

122:11, 123:12, 124:5, 310:22, 314:12,

hypertechnical [1] - 108:1

hypothetical [2] - 317:10, 320:1

314:19, 315:14

IBM [3] - 130:16, 163:16, 250:18 idea [30] - 63:6, 94:14, 97:7, 114:15, 120:18, 121:3, 121:10, 121:24, 124:21, 125:4, 128:1, 128:6, 129:8, 129:12,

-342 130:4, 131:9, 132:20, 133:17, 188:6, 199:24, 204:16, 208:8, 208:20, 208:21, 209:4, 215:1, 284:2, 284:17, 284:24, 285:16 ideas [6] - 118:20, 189:15, 192:16, 192:21, 193:8, 219:7 identical [1] - 180:6 identified [11] - 157:4, 167:12, 181:3, 201:13, 204:20, 215:21, 220:13, 227:21, 228:2, 228:12, 229:7 identify [9] - 26:4, 47:3, 154:20, 157:7, 243:15, 259:19, 260:23, 282:2, 311:7 identifying [2] - 198:24, 260:25 IEEE [3] - 143:16, 143:18, 143:19 illegal [1] - 43:12 illegally [1] - 43:3 illustrate [2] - 127:6, 131:11 illustrated [1] - 106:21 imagine [2] - 92:10, 272:13 immediately [5] - 72:21, 77:18, 175:22, 213:10, 291:12 impact [3] - 66:19, 237:12, 237:14 impacted [2] - 37:7, 37:9 impartial [2] - 13:21, 61:15 impartially [1] - 92:13 implement [2] - 178:25, 184:16 implementation [8] - 176:21, 178:24, 179:2, 183:9, 184:8, 184:19, 185:3, 200.21 implementations [2] - 179:3, 179:4 implemented [12] - 177:12, 177:19, 192:15, 192:21, 198:12, 201:4, 201:6, 201:9, 201:13, 201:20, 201:21, 206:7 **Implemented** [1] - 149:16 implementing [1] - 268:18 implements [1] - 183:10 implication [2] - 322:9, 322:12 implicitly [4] - 183:1, 184:4, 184:24, 185:6 imply [1] - 255:17 implying [1] - 248:9 importance [2] - 12:12, 174:18 important [52] - 12:3, 12:6, 12:11, 24:1, 28:24, 30:7, 45:4, 45:9, 45:25, 46:1, 47:10, 59:17, 70:24, 74:22, 76:19, 77:9, 77:24, 79:11, 83:2, 88:13, 90:11, 94:7,

94:8, 97:16, 98:1, 98:15, 99:5, 99:10, 99:12, 100:18, 101:1, 102:21, 104:21, 104:22, 109:2, 110:1, 110:6, 110:14, 112:9, 119:25, 123:9, 125:12, 126:3, 133:18, 160:25, 220:8, 230:4, 233:23, 240:7, 288:3, 289:24, 299:14 **importantly** [1] - 102:6

importing [2] - 83:16, 87:24 impractical [2] - 185:2, 268:12 impressed [1] - 126:9 impressive [1] - 70:25 improper [2] - 152:20, 153:11 improve [1] - 221:10 improved [1] - 141:25

```
improvement [1] - 115:10
 improvements [1] - 115:22
 improving [1] - 115:13
 in-house [4] - 220:17, 222:8, 228:1,
286:18
 inadmissible [3] - 293:17, 293:21,
295:24
 incentive [1] - 246:3
 inches [2] - 127:12, 127:14
 inclined [2] - 25:2, 312:1
 include [18] - 53:4, 67:7, 87:24, 141:2,
182:10, 187:6, 194:19, 245:13, 280:11,
290:7, 292:19, 293:23, 300:15, 300:18,
301:1, 309:6, 316:7, 317:11
 included [8] - 32:17, 65:2, 104:1,
117:9, 187:4, 201:24, 235:4, 269:3
 includes [11] - 31:8, 65:20, 68:24,
74:24, 77:14, 84:15, 85:9, 304:12,
305:1, 305:3, 314:5
 including [11] - 50:7, 126:17, 170:19,
194:20, 195:18, 221:6, 221:8, 236:9,
252:25, 272:15, 304:12
 inclusive [1] - 172:6
 income [1] - 233:24
 inconsistent [2] - 279:15, 280:2
 inconvenient [1] - 94:2
 incorporate [1] - 268:15
 incorrect [2] - 70:4, 180:7
 increased [2] - 67:11, 88:17
 incremental [1] - 183:22
 indeed [2] - 283:2, 292:13
 independent [7] - 147:13, 152:16,
189:11, 189:14, 247:2, 285:23, 310:5
 independently [1] - 114:6
 INDEX [1] - 4:1
 indicate [8] - 122:4, 122:6, 131:16,
132:12, 182:5, 182:19, 235:22
 indicated [10] - 56:25, 64:21, 125:1,
132:16, 133:10, 171:21, 180:19, 245:19,
273:7, 276:8
 indicates [4] - 124:23, 124:24, 181:16,
182:1
 indicating [1] - 176:11
 indicating) [1] - 104:8
 indication [3] - 175:5, 181:20, 275:23
 indirectly [1] - 202:14
 indiscernible) [1] - 200:25
 individual [8] - 13:18, 40:25, 83:5,
97:22, 102:14, 208:14, 270:25, 278:14
 industry [6] - 140:11, 140:15, 142:20,
188:4, 188:8, 190:17
 iNetwork [4] - 186:15, 188:15, 190:1,
190.22
 iNetworks [3] - 173:6, 185:24, 186:2
 infer [1] - 75:18
 inference [1] - 76:17
 inferences [2] - 75:11, 75:12
```

inferred [1] - 50:4

influence [3] - 61:4, 65:13, 65:15

inform [3] - 77:17, 226:23, 227:6

```
informal [1] - 8:5
 informally [1] - 173:2
 information [31] - 45:9, 54:14, 57:15,
60:3, 89:11, 121:21, 126:1, 160:3,
160:19, 161:9, 202:2, 241:19, 241:20,
241:22, 242:5, 250:5, 250:6, 250:10,
274:1, 274:8, 274:9, 277:15, 280:18,
293:10, 293:22, 293:23, 295:19, 299:24,
316:8, 321:17, 323:6
 informed [1] - 225:2
 infringe [12] - 46:16, 48:6, 48:15,
48:20, 102:17, 105:2, 107:7, 159:1,
159:15, 160:24, 267:18, 268:19
 infringed [17] - 63:4, 83:25, 87:20,
87:23, 88:2, 88:8, 88:11, 91:11, 133:7,
205:5, 205:7, 253:1, 318:14, 318:15,
320:13, 322:11, 323:22
 infringement [46] - 25:15, 35:16, 43:12,
46:16, 48:17, 74:4, 74:5, 83:22, 84:7,
86:25, 87:5, 88:13, 88:15, 90:5, 90:7,
90:13, 91:1, 91:5, 91:15, 91:17, 91:19,
100:4, 100:24, 105:9, 108:12, 108:16,
112:19, 114:20, 115:4, 116:8, 126:19,
127:22, 130:10, 132:9, 132:10, 154:9,
204:21, 205:13, 249:16, 260:19, 274:21,
275:7, 275:9, 300:2, 321:4, 323:20
 infringer [1] - 87:4
 infringers [1] - 83:23
 infringes [3] - 91:14, 104:3, 323:3
 infringing [15] - 25:19, 73:21, 73:25,
112:7, 241:4, 241:9, 241:17, 241:24,
247:1, 247:8, 249:12, 249:13, 253:6,
279:22, 291:1
 ingenious [1] - 129:12
 ingenuity [1] - 167:16
 Initial [1] - 239:21
 initial [2] - 89:4, 244:23
 inline [1] - 23:10
 innovation [2] - 113:24, 217:15
 Innovation [3] - 95:14, 143:16, 143:25
 Innovations [1] - 50:14
 input [9] - 172:18, 176:8, 177:2,
182:12, 182:18, 183:25, 185:11, 207:4,
207:9
 inputs [3] - 182:10, 182:15, 182:20
 inside [9] - 95:23, 122:13, 122:18,
123:7, 127:1, 127:7, 158:20, 160:21,
223:15
 inspection [1] - 19:17
 installing [1] - 286:14
 instance [14] - 9:5, 30:17, 34:1, 35:24,
98:12, 101:17, 104:14, 142:2, 199:18,
222:25, 224:21, 231:18, 242:5, 267:25
 instead [7] - 113:12, 121:17, 130:2,
130:6, 213:18, 264:9, 284:21
 Institute [2] - 136:11, 212:4
 instruct [1] - 114:17
 instructed [4] - 48:14, 108:6, 114:17,
309:17
 instruction [53] - 9:15, 67:7, 85:8,
```

```
94:16, 97:13, 104:18, 121:11, 121:15,
121:16, 121:22, 122:9, 123:13, 123:14,
124:23, 130:21, 131:13, 131:14, 131:16,
131:22, 132:6, 132:8, 132:11, 132:24,
166:22, 175:15, 175:18, 175:21, 175:22,
175:23, 175:25, 176:2, 176:3, 176:7,
176:9, 176:12, 176:13, 177:11, 177:12,
181:2, 181:16, 181:17, 181:20, 182:1,
182:4, 182:5, 199:20, 199:23, 206:25,
207:2, 208:1, 208:20, 315:15
 Instructions [2] - 119:4, 199:1
 instructions [61] - 6:15, 6:17, 6:21,
6:24, 7:2, 7:3, 8:3, 8:6, 8:11, 8:12, 8:19,
8:20, 8:23, 8:25, 9:21, 9:25, 13:6, 29:4,
36:1, 67:8, 68:1, 72:16, 72:25, 73:12,
76:22, 78:5, 92:9, 92:14, 92:16, 92:19,
92:22, 107:24, 108:3, 108:10, 122:2,
122:3, 123:11, 124:10, 124:16, 125:10,
131:24, 131:25, 175:20, 176:3, 177:10,
180:20, 194:22, 200:9, 200:16, 205:8,
205:10, 207:22, 207:25, 209:7, 306:23,
307:1, 316:10, 316:15, 316:25, 317:1
 instrument [2] - 21:25, 221:1
 insurance [1] - 16:14
 Intel [259] - 6:24, 7:19, 7:25, 13:3,
25:18, 25:19, 25:22, 26:6, 27:8, 27:11,
31:3, 31:5, 31:8, 32:6, 32:17, 32:20,
32:25, 33:14, 33:16, 33:21, 33:22,
35:21, 45:23, 46:1, 46:22, 47:12, 48:6,
48:15, 49:6, 49:9, 49:24, 50:6, 53:21,
53:22, 53:23, 53:24, 54:3, 54:12, 54:20,
54:24, 55:9, 55:11, 55:19, 61:1, 61:16,
61:20, 64:15, 64:22, 65:2, 65:12, 66:6,
73:9, 73:10, 73:20, 73:21, 73:24, 83:25,
87:7, 87:10, 87:20, 88:1, 88:5, 91:10,
91:14, 91:15, 94:8, 94:17, 94:21, 98:18,
99:3, 99:8, 100:4, 100:7, 101:22,
101:23, 102:19, 102:20, 103:12, 103:22,
103:25, 104:3, 104:9, 104:11, 104:19,
105:4, 105:16, 105:20, 105:23, 105:24,
105:25, 106:25, 107:4, 107:16, 108:14,
109:18, 109:23, 110:2, 110:24, 111:12,
111:18, 112:1, 112:6, 112:14, 113:5,
113:14, 113:23, 113:25, 114:1, 114:7,
114:22, 115:5, 115:11, 115:12, 115:18,
115:19, 115:23, 116:16, 116:17, 116:20,
117:2, 117:16, 125:6, 125:23, 126:7,
126:8, 126:15, 126:16, 128:9, 128:13,
128:16, 129:2, 129:4, 130:13, 133:6,
133:7, 133:15, 133:22, 154:23, 155:4,
157:21, 158:13, 158:14, 158:18, 159:8,
159:14, 159:19, 160:2, 160:4, 160:23,
161:6, 161:12, 161:18, 166:20, 166:24,
168:2, 204:11, 204:14, 205:1, 205:22,
231:7, 232:11, 232:15, 235:3, 235:10,
235:24, 235:25, 237:24, 241:4, 241:8,
241:12, 241:17, 241:21, 241:23, 242:19,
242:23, 248:5, 248:11, 248:19, 248:24,
248:25, 249:12, 249:19, 250:22, 253:1,
253:5, 253:6, 253:18, 254:4, 254:8,
254:17, 256:14, 256:15, 256:20, 259:24,
```

```
260:22. 262:5. 266:11. 266:19. 267:6.
267:10, 267:15, 267:16, 267:22, 268:5,
268:10, 268:11, 268:12, 268:15, 268:17,
268:18, 268:25, 269:11, 269:15, 269:23,
272:12, 272:13, 274:15, 275:3, 275:6,
276:14, 277:1, 277:10, 277:14, 277:25,
278:4, 278:9, 279:16, 279:19, 279:21,
279:25, 280:4, 280:17, 280:22, 290:15,
290:16, 290:20, 291:1, 291:6, 291:11,
291:15, 291:18, 297:11, 303:3, 304:4,
306:23, 307:2, 313:7, 313:23, 315:23,
315:25, 318:2, 319:14, 323:3
 Intel's [24] - 53:18, 61:21, 100:23,
101:10, 102:6, 102:25, 107:5, 113:2,
126:18, 130:16, 148:3, 154:8, 159:1,
159:4, 268:2, 269:1, 274:1, 274:4,
274:22, 277:4, 279:7, 299:23, 305:18,
322:1
 intellectual [6] - 205:19, 218:2, 219:5,
243:17, 244:14, 268:6
 Intellectual [4] - 231:11, 231:13,
231:19
 intend [1] - 321:5
 intended [4] - 14:6, 142:16, 142:17,
201:23
 intent [1] - 180:24
 intention [3] - 43:19, 159:25, 220:6
 interactions [1] - 238:20
 Interconnect [2] - 128:10, 133:16
 interest [10] - 55:3, 113:19, 157:10,
161:19, 167:8, 231:20, 254:23, 257:10,
270:17, 290:1
 interested [11] - 142:11, 170:24,
177:15, 217:3, 228:25, 229:25, 254:6,
257:5, 257:8, 260:25, 294:10
 interesting [4] - 107:5, 123:24, 125:24,
126.12
 interestingly [1] - 30:25
 interests [2] - 284:7, 284:25
 interface [1] - 141:6
 interim [1] - 222:21
 interior [1] - 17:22
 intermediate [1] - 184:25
 internal [9] - 102:7, 103:22, 104:11,
104:19, 173:4, 221:4, 241:11, 252:9,
286:15
 international [1] - 143:19
 Internet [32] - 79:6, 95:10, 95:17,
95:20, 96:18, 97:21, 101:15, 114:25,
115:2, 119:14, 119:22, 126:21, 140:23,
141:8, 141:9, 141:12, 141:15, 141:17,
142:21, 143:17, 144:22, 157:2, 164:22,
175:11, 187:5, 214:1, 226:2, 226:3,
232:18, 243:15, 245:14
 Internet-type [1] - 187:5
 internetwork [1] - 160:5
 Internetworking [1] - 164:6
 interpret [1] - 159:20
                                               investigation [1] - 241:7
```

interpretation [3] - 270:8, 270:12,

interpretations [3] - 90:14, 90:18

280:10

```
interpreted [2] - 185:8, 185:14
                                               invite [1] - 255:21
 interrupt [2] - 128:4, 140:2
                                               invited [1] - 134:8
 interrupted [1] - 184:1
                                               invoke [1] - 93:3
 intervening [2] - 117:12, 126:18
                                               involve [2] - 55:19
 interviews [1] - 273:16
                                               involved [32] - 26:11, 26:24, 34:1,
                                              34:22, 34:23, 73:22, 78:13, 79:23,
 intimate [1] - 65:16
 introduce [14] - 11:20, 26:11, 113:25,
                                              100:17, 104:16, 141:15, 142:25, 149:4,
114:10. 114:13. 125:2. 127:24. 128:7.
                                              150:24, 172:8, 187:18, 192:24, 202:12,
135:22, 169:11, 210:19, 282:1, 282:8,
                                              211:17, 211:20, 212:17, 217:1, 224:7,
313:11
                                              226:7, 238:23, 249:1, 251:16, 253:7,
                                              262:14, 274:3, 288:11, 290:25
 introduced [3] - 33:24, 75:21, 76:25
                                               involvement [1] - 155:6
 introduces [1] - 232:16
                                               involves [3] - 12:20, 87:15, 142:1
 introducing [2] - 74:17, 133:2
                                               involving [1] - 157:5
 Introduction [1] - 259:4
                                               IP [4] - 226:9, 230:5, 245:15, 286:9
 introduction [2] - 75:15, 113:23
 invade [1] - 14:7
                                               IP3 [3] - 272:12, 272:24, 274:19
 invalid [11] - 35:22, 74:3, 84:6, 87:6,
                                               iPhone [1] - 166:10
                                               Iraq [1] - 143:11
88:7, 88:9, 88:11, 90:12, 108:18,
114:18, 133:6
                                               iRouter [14] - 99:14, 147:3, 149:4,
 invalidate [3] - 110:12, 110:23, 256:17
                                              150:6, 150:11, 150:21, 151:7, 151:25,
                                              173:5, 193:5, 298:12, 298:15, 298:18,
 invalidating [1] - 256:16
                                              298:23
 \textbf{invalidity} \, [15] - 6:9, \, 36:7, \, 74:4, \, 74:6, \,
                                               Irvine [12] - 147:7, 147:8, 147:24,
85:6, 90:13, 91:1, 91:5, 91:21, 91:24,
                                              152:4, 155:6, 156:3, 159:10, 159:11,
114:10, 126:2, 307:7, 307:9, 307:18
                                              159:13, 173:6, 188:2, 192:14
 invent [6] - 97:7, 198:17, 208:23,
                                               IS [1] - 324:15
209:12, 209:14, 283:20
invented [12] - 94:11, 95:25, 96:16,
                                               ISD [2] - 22:25, 23:2
97:6, 100:8, 150:5, 206:20, 206:25,
                                               Island [1] - 137:1
207:11, 207:24, 208:8, 208:21
                                               issue [53] - 6:15, 8:17, 9:8, 9:14, 49:1,
 inventing [1] - 286:18
                                              49:2, 49:21, 49:25, 50:7, 65:7, 65:8,
                                              79:5, 80:6, 85:6, 85:15, 91:8, 91:17,
 invention [38] - 25:24, 38:4, 38:20,
48:11, 83:14, 83:16, 84:5, 84:18, 85:10,
                                              98:19, 101:10, 101:22, 102:12, 103:25,
                                              112:14, 114:6, 149:21, 150:14, 152:12,
86:15, 86:21, 87:1, 89:12, 90:2, 95:9,
                                              160:9, 167:9, 204:14, 229:15, 230:14,
96:19. 100:20. 101:14. 101:16. 113:9.
                                              231:21, 238:2, 247:25, 248:15, 253:22,
119:2, 156:16, 172:9, 172:17, 172:19,
                                              258:16, 263:12, 265:13, 297:18, 306:11,
208:25, 224:20, 229:3, 229:17, 229:25,
                                              306:22, 307:22, 309:21, 315:1, 315:12,
247:5, 264:9, 264:10, 267:12, 288:1,
                                              317:2, 317:17, 318:3, 320:3, 323:10
288:4
                                               issued [21] - 35:23, 49:8, 86:20, 86:23,
 inventions [17] - 94:20, 94:21, 97:16,
98:21, 99:3, 111:9, 149:7, 151:6,
                                              89:2, 99:25, 100:7, 114:12, 117:13,
                                              138:24, 218:16, 218:21, 229:14, 234:23,
153:18, 154:11, 274:23, 274:24, 283:20,
                                              241:18, 247:22, 279:16, 307:1, 311:25,
283:24, 286:18, 301:4
                                              318:1, 319:3
 inventive [1] - 118:18
                                               issues [21] - 8:8, 46:2, 49:14, 64:3,
 inventor [24] - 52:23, 52:25, 83:8,
                                              66:15, 67:4, 74:4, 84:6, 91:1, 102:24,
84:13, 89:2, 138:22, 150:12, 155:14,
                                              103:10, 121:22, 127:23, 133:11, 167:17,
156:21, 171:16, 171:19, 172:1, 172:7,
                                              167:19, 174:23, 174:24, 185:20, 312:2,
211:23, 241:16, 247:17, 262:20, 265:10,
                                              316:17
283:15, 283:16, 284:6, 299:10, 299:11,
                                               IT [2] - 145:18, 286:12
301:1
 Inventor [1] - 271:22
                                               item [1] - 80:25
                                               items [2] - 302:1, 302:9
 inventor's [1] - 271:20
 inventors [12] - 83:5, 151:22, 172:5,
                                               iteration [1] - 121:20
                                               itself [8] - 33:21, 124:21, 131:21, 174:5,
246:10, 246:18, 283:12, 283:14, 284:5,
                                              175:6, 214:23, 248:3, 249:9
284:16, 284:18, 285:17, 285:23
                                               IXP [3] - 161:11, 204:17, 204:19
 invest [3] - 216:7, 216:9, 284:23
                                               IXP1250 [1] - 125:8
 invested [1] - 55:3
                                               IXP225 [1] - 124:3
 investigate [2] - 160:8, 205:18
```

investigator [1] - 19:3

investment [2] - 242:17, 242:24

IXP2800 [3] - 205:2, 205:5, 205:6

J

JACKSON [1] - 324:20 Jackson [1] - 11:24 Jaime [5] - 26:22, 53:5, 94:1, 281:16,

Jaime [5] - 26:22, 53:5, 94:1, 281:16, 282:4

James [1] - 18:25

January [8] - 89:2, 99:24, 170:11, 235:20, 255:25, 256:2, 270:17, 277:25

Jason [2] - 93:25, 286:3

Jeff [1] - 20:24

jeopardy [1] - 92:15

Jerry [2] - 18:18, 22:5

Joanne [1] - 21:8

job [13] - 72:24, 73:3, 84:9, 87:8, 123:14, 132:12, 173:2, 173:4, 213:20, 214:18, 215:16, 226:18, 226:19

jobs [2] - 121:18, 124:11

Joe [2] - 15:12, 17:21

Joffre [1] - 53:8

John [3] - 34:11, 34:13, 34:14

Johnston [3] - 17:20, 17:21, 24:8

join [1] - 126:7

joined [1] - 218:15

joining [2] - 216:21, 298:2

joint [1] - 231:16

JONES [78] - 7:18, 11:4, 25:6, 27:6, 28:10, 45:15, 46:13, 46:21, 47:1, 47:5, 51:1, 51:4, 51:9, 51:12, 51:15, 51:19, 51:23, 52:2, 52:5, 52:8, 52:12, 52:16, 52:20, 52:22, 54:4, 54:7, 54:10, 54:15, 54:21, 55:6, 55:14, 56:11, 56:16, 56:18, 57:4, 57:10, 57:13, 58:11, 58:14, 58:18, 60:6, 60:9, 60:14, 60:17, 60:20, 61:3, 61:9, 61:23, 62:7, 62:13, 62:16, 62:20, 63:10, 64:11, 65:6, 67:5, 67:15, 67:22, 68:4, 70:2, 72:2, 293:14, 294:8, 294:16, 295:5, 295:19, 296:2, 296:19, 301:11, 304:14, 304:20, 304:22, 305:7, 305:24, 306:2, 318:12, 318:22, 320:9

Jones [26] - 7:18, 15:5, 15:6, 27:5, 27:7, 27:21, 28:9, 29:16, 30:24, 33:24, 34:4, 34:10, 34:16, 41:21, 45:14, 45:17, 47:12, 47:16, 58:16, 64:10, 65:5, 94:7, 304:22, 318:9, 318:10

judge [2] - 11:15, 65:13

Judge [6] - 11:17, 14:4, 36:1, 47:22,

101:2, 321:11

judges [2] - 12:7, 65:19

judgment [2] - 253:11, 254:2

judicial [2] - 66:8, 66:14

July [2] - 170:16, 185:23

June [2] - 190:23, 193:4

Junior [1] - 169:19

junk [1] - 111:16

juries [2] - 31:2, 220:20

juror [16] - 13:18, 14:20, 24:6, 28:19, 30:12, 30:13, 47:3, 51:10, 54:8, 61:16, 65:21, 66:16, 79:16, 79:17, 79:20,

100:12

Juror [64] - 14:25, 15:2, 15:5, 15:11, 15:20, 16:3, 16:19, 17:2, 17:9, 17:21, 18:7, 19:9, 19:16, 19:24, 20:6, 21:20, 22:4, 23:8, 24:15, 24:18, 26:5, 47:5, 50:23, 51:5, 51:13, 52:3, 52:5, 52:13, 54:17, 54:22, 55:8, 56:12, 57:1, 57:25, 58:3, 58:9, 58:11, 58:15, 58:19, 58:21, 58:22, 59:1, 59:25, 60:22, 61:19, 61:25, 62:14, 62:20, 64:21, 65:7, 65:9, 71:7, 71:9, 71:11, 71:13, 71:15, 71:17, 71:19, 71:21

JUROR [109] - 15:4, 15:11, 15:19, 16:2, 16:7, 16:12, 16:18, 17:2, 17:8, 17:13, 17:20, 18:6, 18:17, 18:24, 19:8, 19:15, 19:23, 20:5, 20:13, 20:23, 21:7, 21:19, 22:3, 22:13, 22:22, 23:7, 24:7, 24:14, 24:18, 24:24, 26:5, 31:13, 31:15, 31:19, 31:23, 32:2, 32:4, 32:11, 33:8, 33:10, 33:13, 33:17, 34:3, 34:6, 36:21, 37:16, 39:16, 39:23, 40:4, 40:7, 40:12, 40:18, 40:21, 41:15, 41:25, 42:2, 42:16, 42:18, 42:23, 43:2, 43:7, 43:8, 43:11, 43:14, 44:13, 46:12, 46:19, 46:24, 50:25, 51:3, 51:7, 51:14, 51:17, 51:25, 52:4, 52:7, 52:9, 52:15, 52:18, 52:21, 54:2, 54:5, 54:9, 54:11, 54:18, 54:23, 55:9, 56:9, 56:13, 56:17, 57:3, 57:5, 57:12, 58:10, 58:13, 58:17, 60:4, 60:7, 60:11, 60:15, 60:18, 60:24, 61:5, 61:6, 61:19, 62:1, 62:11, 62:15, 62:23

Jurors [3] - 11:9, 25:11, 64:6
jurors [35] - 6:5, 12:16, 12:17, 12:22,
13:16, 14:14, 14:21, 25:3, 26:13, 45:25,
49:12, 50:2, 62:18, 63:15, 63:17, 63:22,
64:1, 68:8, 68:12, 68:22, 69:9, 69:19,
70:11, 71:1, 71:2, 71:3, 71:6, 72:5,
72:10, 72:22, 77:20, 77:22, 82:1, 82:4,
168:15

JURUR [1] - 51:21

jury [118] - 6:7, 6:16, 7:16, 8:2, 8:6, 8:18, 8:22, 10:11, 10:15, 10:17, 10:25, 11:6, 11:11, 12:3, 12:4, 12:7, 12:8, 12:20, 12:25, 13:6, 13:7, 13:20, 13:22, 14:8, 23:17, 23:20, 24:3, 27:16, 30:16, 39:10, 40:1, 45:16, 50:2, 63:13, 67:8, 67:25, 68:9, 70:8, 70:14, 70:16, 71:5, 71:8, 71:10, 71:12, 71:14, 71:16, 71:18, 71:20, 71:22, 71:24, 72:7, 72:14, 76:10, 76:15, 78:22, 79:2, 79:13, 79:20, 81:10, 81:23, 87:19, 88:22, 125:25, 134:16, 134:21, 135:2, 135:23, 139:16, 146:2, 146:18, 147:5, 148:6, 151:12, 152:2, 154:4, 154:8, 168:12, 210:3, 210:19, 211:13, 212:21, 216:1, 220:5, 220:21, 222:3, 224:11, 225:7, 230:9, 232:3, 236:23, 241:14, 266:2, 266:4, 266:5, 266:24, 282:1, 282:9, 298:6, 301:17, 302:2, 302:4, 302:7, 303:25, 305:10, 305:12, 306:23, 307:1, 308:1, 309:17, 310:3, 314:5, 315:15, 315:16, 316:10, 322:3, 324:9

justice [2] - 12:12, 79:12

Κ

keep [5] - 13:11, 76:19, 81:16, 163:25, 234:4

keeping [1] - 76:15

Kentucky [1] - 20:20

Kevin [8] - 19:15, 26:25, 28:2, 93:24, 238:13, 238:15, 281:14, 282:10

KEVIN [1] - 281:21

key [2] - 152:15, 236:14

kiddos [1] - 30:15

kidney [1] - 24:8

kids [6] - 15:17, 19:12, 211:15, 211:17, 211:20

kids' [1] - 30:2

kimbrell [1] - 52:3

Kimbrell [14] - 19:16, 19:17, 32:10, 32:14, 32:21, 33:1, 40:16, 41:18, 44:11, 54:17, 58:3, 59:1, 59:10, 62:10

kind [42] - 18:8, 25:22, 30:12, 30:13, 30:16, 30:23, 60:24, 78:16, 118:8, 119:19, 120:1, 120:2, 121:9, 126:24, 128:2, 128:24, 130:8, 130:9, 130:21, 132:7, 139:23, 184:16, 186:10, 189:17, 192:21, 201:20, 203:8, 216:8, 220:2, 220:9, 220:19, 221:1, 221:7, 233:20, 246:1, 247:3, 249:24, 252:18, 283:10, 311:18, 316:12, 320:11

kindly [1] - 133:10

kinds [7] - 30:13, 119:23, 120:8, 132:1, 272:13, 286:7, 292:6

King [1] - 17:17

knowing [1] - 174:18

knowledge [18] - 55:17, 55:20, 56:21, 56:22, 57:14, 59:18, 61:3, 84:3, 160:6, 160:15, 168:4, 191:1, 226:16, 242:8, 262:24, 280:22

known [15] - 50:18, 84:4, 85:11, 112:6, 112:9, 118:12, 186:25, 196:3, 208:22, 209:16, 212:22, 215:13, 223:22, 227:14, 297:19

knows [6] - 65:24, 102:24, 244:23, 261:6, 321:9

L

Laats [11] - 214:3, 215:24, 216:12, 217:12, 218:15, 224:3, 227:19, 238:11, 238:20, 275:14, 287:10

Laats' [1] - 217:24

labeled [1] - 175:15

labels [1] - 158:9

labor [1] - 222:9

Laboratory [2] - 140:9

lack [3] - 152:21, 153:11, 297:25

ladies [45] - 11:10, 22:10, 35:5, 38:8,

44:16, 45:5, 45:16, 70:13, 94:9, 94:17,

```
98:15, 98:18, 99:1, 99:8, 100:20, 101:9,
101:19, 101:25, 103:20, 104:3, 104:15,
105:21, 106:20, 107:14, 108:13, 108:20,
109:4, 109:7, 110:3, 111:12, 111:20,
112:4, 112:9, 112:19, 112:25, 132:16,
139:16, 146:17, 151:11, 153:16, 211:12,
220:4, 228:10, 232:3, 241:14
 Ladonna [1] - 15:20
 lady [1] - 286:1
 land [1] - 15:21
 landman [1] - 20:1
 language [16] - 90:8, 120:1, 120:2,
120:10, 120:23, 121:1, 121:5, 124:21,
132:23, 132:24, 174:14, 174:23, 251:9,
267:15, 267:17, 267:23
 languages [7] - 119:16, 119:18,
119:20, 119:24, 120:5, 120:7, 120:12
 lap [1] - 115:9
 laptop [3] - 54:2, 96:14, 115:8
 large [14] - 34:11, 56:5, 56:14, 56:15,
84:25, 97:22, 137:8, 137:24, 157:1,
178:8, 218:16, 218:19, 225:12, 284:14
 largely [1] - 139:9
 larger [3] - 55:24, 148:23, 188:7
 largest [3] - 140:1, 242:22, 242:24
 Larry [6] - 20:14, 273:20, 276:1, 276:3,
279:6
 last [23] - 6:8, 44:24, 62:18, 74:22,
95:12, 143:22, 145:15, 172:21, 173:8,
178:3, 188:20, 203:16, 204:2, 221:21,
229:7, 244:11, 244:12, 245:21, 255:23,
306:21, 306:24, 307:12, 313:14
 lastly [2] - 139:14, 151:19
 Latchford [1] - 53:6
 Late [3] - 95:8, 95:9, 141:14
 late [8] - 79:1, 142:7, 144:21, 146:16,
147:22, 311:21, 319:24, 322:16
 latest [1] - 179:22
 latter [2] - 181:20, 195:15
 Lattice [17] - 261:23, 292:5, 292:6,
292:10, 292:17, 292:19, 293:2, 296:6,
296:8, 296:12, 296:18, 297:1, 297:5,
320:3, 321:16, 323:5, 323:13
 Laud [1] - 11:21
 law [28] - 11:21, 14:17, 23:11, 29:3,
34:10, 34:11, 34:15, 34:17, 34:20,
34:21, 49:17, 72:17, 72:25, 85:7, 89:23,
99:18, 155:14, 243:17, 244:1, 244:14,
253:16, 283:8, 283:10, 283:11, 284:8,
284:9, 285:3, 320:4
 Lawn [1] - 22:16
 lawsuit [16] - 36:15, 36:19, 37:24, 38:8,
38:20, 39:6, 204:9, 225:19, 225:22,
226:5, 226:20, 226:24, 231:21, 250:7,
268:22, 297:14
 Lawsuit [3] - 44:18, 44:22
 lawsuits [10] - 36:24, 37:1, 37:7, 37:22,
39:2, 48:8, 55:16, 55:18, 134:5, 254:2
```

lawyer [14] - 26:20, 26:22, 26:23, 27:7,

29:19, 34:15, 45:17, 76:14, 76:18,

174:22, 267:4, 268:13, 272:18, 275:4

```
191:20, 191:23, 192:1, 192:6, 192:11,
 lawyers [40] - 12:21, 13:15, 13:16,
                                               195:17, 228:5, 228:21, 230:9
13:19, 13:21, 23:16, 26:10, 26:14,
                                                levels [3] - 139:14, 145:11, 192:10
27:16, 29:8, 34:18, 63:13, 63:18, 63:22,
64:3, 70:14, 73:5, 74:12, 74:23, 76:9,
                                                Lexington [2] - 211:5, 211:6
76:10, 77:15, 77:25, 78:5, 78:8, 78:13,
                                                liability [1] - 133:13
79:7, 80:3, 81:24, 82:3, 82:23, 148:3,
                                                librarian [1] - 21:1
174:8, 272:15, 272:16, 273:3, 273:24,
                                                license [32] - 83:19, 83:22, 105:3,
277:3, 277:5, 301:25
                                               154:5, 167:20, 168:3, 224:22, 225:3,
 lawyers' [2] - 13:24, 75:1
                                              229:25, 230:5, 231:2, 233:5, 233:15,
 lay [4] - 6:24, 66:16, 101:3, 192:12
                                              235:2, 237:17, 237:19, 237:23, 248:5,
 layer [1] - 195:22
                                              257:14, 270:21, 270:24, 274:18, 278:13,
 LBJ [1] - 117:10
                                              279:19, 295:13, 296:14, 296:17, 296:18,
 Leach [5] - 15:12, 16:13, 16:14, 24:18
                                              317:10, 320:21, 321:11, 323:5
 lead [9] - 66:6, 115:3, 130:9, 146:21,
                                                licensed [4] - 19:1, 162:9, 237:18,
                                              285:21
149:6, 215:19, 217:4, 244:25, 304:13
                                                licenses [20] - 83:20, 133:25, 167:20,
 leading [6] - 146:5, 153:2, 159:5,
                                              237:5, 237:9, 237:11, 257:8, 267:10,
166:6, 191:3, 252:6
                                              292:19, 298:17, 298:19, 300:6, 300:8,
 lean [2] - 46:19, 57:11
                                              300:11, 300:15, 300:22, 300:24, 301:1,
 leaning [1] - 46:22
                                              322:23, 323:12
 learn [14] - 79:6, 94:10, 95:6, 98:25,
99:13, 103:2, 104:7, 106:5, 106:14,
                                                licensing [18] - 154:7, 224:14, 224:15,
109:16, 110:2, 133:24, 206:14, 227:2
                                              224:17, 227:10, 227:23, 230:24, 231:8,
                                              231:16, 231:18, 234:6, 236:6, 236:17,
 learned [1] - 126:8
                                              241:1, 253:24, 267:9, 321:14
 least [4] - 42:24, 258:5, 279:18, 308:16
                                                lick [1] - 112:20
 leave [4] - 12:24, 25:8, 78:21, 81:14
                                                lie [2] - 242:23, 318:5
 leaving [1] - 178:9
                                                life [3] - 30:11, 30:20, 97:1
 led [7] - 115:11, 204:22, 205:6, 226:16,
                                                light [6] - 126:2, 310:22, 313:9, 315:14,
232:18, 241:20, 284:6
                                               315:17, 315:22
 Leffall [4] - 18:7, 18:8, 58:11, 58:13
                                                likelihood [1] - 275:2
 left [20] - 11:22, 14:23, 27:10, 33:3,
                                                \textbf{likely} \, {\tiny [5]} - 39:11,\, 40:1,\, 270:1,\, 270:10,\,
69:1, 80:9, 89:4, 111:3, 117:8, 144:23,
                                               275.2
144:24, 170:12, 171:3, 171:9, 186:13,
                                                likewise [3] - 64:16, 65:2, 78:19
207:21, 215:22, 245:22, 252:5
 left-hand [4] - 33:3, 80:9, 89:4, 207:21
                                                limine [4] - 6:8, 9:14, 306:13, 307:23
                                                limit [1] - 264:9
 legal [8] - 23:11, 34:18, 34:19, 48:2,
                                                limitation [3] - 103:18, 131:13, 291:10
267:18, 273:6, 274:2, 274:9
 legally [1] - 86:22
                                                limitations [6] - 107:19, 119:10,
 legs [1] - 134:22
                                               124:20, 206:13, 263:20, 263:22
 legwork [1] - 238:23
                                                limited [6] - 76:2, 77:6, 77:9, 101:16,
                                              261:6, 322:1
 Leland [1] - 169:19
                                                line [23] - 10:24, 89:15, 106:7, 107:6,
 length [2] - 196:13, 197:18
                                               108:15, 111:5, 161:11, 177:9, 180:10,
 lengths [1] - 196:8
                                               181:12, 182:9, 214:25, 226:3, 264:2,
 LensCrafters [1] - 22:18
                                              264:12, 270:16, 270:19, 270:23, 271:2,
 Leslie [2] - 93:25, 286:2
                                              278:3, 278:11, 278:21, 313:24
 less [9] - 38:2, 39:10, 40:1, 66:3,
141:18, 257:19, 257:24, 262:2, 276:7
                                                linear [1] - 170:4
 lesser [1] - 36:6
                                                lines [4] - 176:7, 179:9, 213:7, 213:19
                                                link [5] - 128:10, 128:17, 129:3, 131:18,
 \textbf{letter}\, {\tiny [38]} - 59:6,\, 112:12,\, 112:22,\,
                                               132:2
116:15, 116:18, 126:15, 158:1, 158:17,
                                                LinkedIn [4] - 243:16, 243:20, 244:6,
166:13, 228:18, 232:4, 232:8, 235:10,
                                               244:22
254:12, 254:17, 254:22, 255:8, 255:13,
                                                links [1] - 158:20
255:21, 269:4, 269:10, 269:24, 270:9,
                                                List [2] - 80:7, 302:16
270:16, 270:17, 270:19, 271:12, 273:10,
                                                list [22] - 14:16, 27:21, 69:7, 69:15,
273:15, 275:13, 275:19, 275:22, 278:6,
                                               81:4, 89:18, 124:5, 174:10, 228:19,
278:7, 278:17, 279:17, 280:6, 280:19
                                               235:4, 252:19, 254:5, 255:1, 255:6,
 letters [6] - 145:19, 253:24, 255:20,
                                              255:13, 256:21, 257:17, 258:1, 269:4,
272:13, 272:25, 273:3
                                              302:20, 302:23
 level [23] - 108:2, 127:3, 127:4, 138:25,
                                                listed [8] - 69:21, 85:16, 155:13, 172:5,
145:12, 147:6, 149:20, 151:12, 152:13,
161:10, 166:14, 170:21, 188:3, 189:21,
                                               172:6, 195:1, 264:23, 300:25
```

listen [6] - 102:22, 102:23, 109:10, 110:5, 123:9, 223:15 listening [1] - 119:20 listing [2] - 243:16, 251:2 lists [3] - 150:12, 171:16, 171:19 literally [3] - 102:4, 128:2, 268:9 litigate [1] - 262:2 litigation [9] - 134:6, 154:2, 226:22. 226:24, 253:12, 258:17, 261:13, 261:15, 261:19 litigations [2] - 243:17, 244:14 live [11] - 38:11, 38:25, 74:9, 74:14, 74:16, 98:2, 136:5, 136:6, 211:4, 211:5, 286:4 lived [1] - 45:19 lives [5] - 98:1, 98:11, 118:3, 144:16, 144:17 living [2] - 147:15, 211:8 LLC [4] - 13:2, 25:16, 199:2, 266:18 Lloyd [1] - 53:7 lo [2] - 100:5, 205:4 local [3] - 19:18, 22:5, 286:11 localize [1] - 143:6 locally [1] - 286:5 located [2] - 95:3, 138:2 log [2] - 98:4, 176:20 Logic [1] - 198:25 logic [6] - 176:5, 183:6, 183:21, 192:13, 194:19, 201:9 logical [1] - 183:11 long-term [1] - 234:3 Longview [5] - 26:20, 29:19, 29:24, 96:2, 98:2 look [68] - 11:18, 12:14, 14:24, 34:5, 80:6, 89:1, 104:25, 106:25, 117:18, 119:13, 123:9, 131:12, 134:11, 149:10, 150:8, 150:17, 152:10, 160:19, 162:21, 163:10, 166:16, 176:18, 186:20, 187:17, 189:3, 189:6, 202:1, 205:22, 218:2, 229:1, 230:6, 230:9, 230:11, 232:12, 232:22, 233:12, 233:17, 234:10, 234:15, 234:16, 234:22, 242:2, 250:12, 253:13, 253:14, 254:16, 254:17, 256:13, 256:24, 257:1, 257:5, 258:20, 258:25, 260:17, 263:7, 263:11, 264:2, 268:7, 268:13, 272:25, 274:3, 288:17, 294:18, 300:4, 312:14, 321:23 looked [20] - 112:14, 112:17, 112:23, 122:1, 160:20, 205:1, 219:5, 219:11, 219:22, 220:14, 224:13, 227:9, 230:23, 246:21, 247:4, 247:11, 247:13, 255:6, 273:1 looking [23] - 8:18, 90:7, 90:13, 103:21, 164:12, 166:22, 187:23, 188:17, 199:9, 204:5, 214:20, 216:15, 217:2, 225:14, 233:15, 233:20, 236:16, 240:11, 248:25,

258:14, 258:18, 291:6, 295:8

269:18

loud [1] - 322:18

looks [5] - 88:25, 122:20, 131:2, 200:2,

Louis [1] - 169:15 Love [1] - 321:11 love [3] - 18:3, 18:14, 61:22 low [3] - 192:1, 195:17, 213:25 low-level [2] - 192:1, 195:17 lower [3] - 106:18, 162:3, 252:3 LPC [1] - 29:21 Lucent [1] - 322:24 Luke [1] - 29:25 lump [5] - 317:8, 319:6, 320:14, 322:2, 322:21 lump-sum [3] - 317:8, 320:14, 322:2 lunar [1] - 136:21 lunch [9] - 68:2, 72:20, 72:21, 78:23, 134:14, 134:19, 134:20, 134:21, 134:23 **LVN** [1] - 19:4 Lynda [1] - 22:3 М

ma'am [29] - 32:1, 33:12, 33:15, 40:3, 40:5, 41:24, 42:1, 42:5, 56:18, 59:25, 60:6, 60:17, 61:18, 62:7, 286:6, 286:23, 288:8, 288:12, 289:2, 290:9, 292:18, 292:21, 295:15, 296:7, 296:16, 297:2, 297:6, 298:16, 300:20 machine [2] - 121:12, 176:4 machines [1] - 214:24 machinist [1] - 22:6 Maddox [4] - 27:12, 28:11, 53:16, 116:25 magazine [2] - 53:22, 54:13 Mail [1] - 128:22 mail [20] - 141:20, 141:21, 217:17, 235:20, 238:22, 248:13, 248:14, 248:22, 250:23, 255:13, 274:16, 277:22, 278:11, 278:17, 279:5, 279:7, 279:14, 279:20, 312:9 mails [5] - 78:20, 189:4, 202:20, 280:2, 289:10 main [4] - 73:7, 89:20, 138:3, 209:8 maintain [2] - 229:21, 314:12 maintenance [1] - 229:22 major [7] - 22:7, 22:8, 48:5, 214:4, 223:24, 245:1 majority [2] - 133:16, 139:5 malpractice [1] - 56:15 man [4] - 102:24, 135:25, 211:2, 238:13 manage [2] - 131:25, 284:15 managed [2] - 115:24, 272:20 management [3] - 186:10, 227:18, 258:18 manager [12] - 15:7, 15:13, 17:15, 20:15, 20:20, 20:25, 21:10, 21:11, 21:16, 22:16, 124:5, 191:6 manufacture [1] - 222:12 manufactured [4] - 116:13, 116:19, 222:8, 222:15 manufacturers [1] - 292:8

Marilyn [2] - 17:20, 24:7 mark [3] - 269:9, 275:12, 277:21 marked [4] - 198:20, 234:17, 250:13, 302:20 market [5] - 96:8, 215:6, 246:15, 247:13, 262:21 marketing [1] - 22:5 marketplace [1] - 133:20 marks [1] - 266:16 married [5] - 17:9, 29:21, 136:3, 210:25, 282:12 martial [1] - 19:21 Mary [3] - 20:24, 28:12, 111:17 Massachusetts [8] - 95:3, 125:7, 136:7, 136:11, 138:3, 211:5, 211:6, master's [3] - 137:1, 169:18, 283:7 match [4] - 179:23, 179:25, 180:1, 260:14 matching [1] - 194:21 material [2] - 174:3, 308:24 materially [1] - 155:15 materials [1] - 148:11 math [2] - 58:6, 211:15 mathematical [8] - 97:12, 120:9, 177:1, 178:16, 178:17, 178:19, 183:7, 183:10 mathematics [1] - 177:3 Matt [3] - 28:17, 125:5, 125:19 matt [1] - 24:18 matter [17] - 59:7, 59:8, 86:13, 90:19, 92:8, 92:10, 127:21, 139:1, 152:13, 155:4, 189:1, 235:13, 266:18, 277:16, 283:18, 299:8, 320:4 matters [4] - 6:6, 76:11, 251:1, 321:17 Matthew [1] - 16:12 maximum [1] - 319:9 McDaniel [1] - 16:3 McKenzie [3] - 20:6, 20:7, 37:14 mean [36] - 14:12, 14:13, 23:24, 23:25, 24:23, 46:17, 54:12, 59:19, 65:10, 65:18, 68:23, 68:25, 74:7, 75:4, 75:5, 80:24, 86:20, 144:3, 180:2, 183:4, 198:2, 198:14, 201:7, 225:16, 226:24, 233:6, 246:3, 246:17, 247:20, 252:20, 260:23, 261:1, 279:5, 279:14, 304:10, 320:10 meaning [4] - 101:3, 101:5, 286:12, 286:17 meaningful [2] - 156:19, 252:10 means [20] - 35:17, 36:2, 36:3, 38:14, 73:20, 91:12, 93:6, 100:24, 104:3, 106:8, 108:12, 110:12, 110:19, 116:20, 139:19, 195:15, 214:17, 279:14, 306:7 meant [4] - 62:19, 257:4, 259:22, 260:8 measured [1] - 127:11 measures [1] - 77:18 mechanic [1] - 16:13 **Medal** [3] - 95:14, 115:18, 143:24

Marcus [1] - 18:10

margin [2] - 106:6, 106:7

MARCH [2] - 6:2, 324:14

```
Media [1] - 50:14
 media [2] - 223:24, 245:16
 medical [2] - 21:23, 56:14
 meet [6] - 48:16, 87:3, 139:14, 243:9,
243:10, 272:25
 meeting [2] - 118:2, 273:2
 meetings [2] - 272:21, 273:4
 Megan [1] - 19:23
 Melanie [2] - 53:8, 303:14
 member [5] - 36:18, 44:19, 44:20,
44:21. 56:4
 members [13] - 63:13, 125:25, 134:16,
146:1, 147:5, 148:6, 152:2, 216:1,
220:21, 224:11, 225:7, 230:9, 236:23
 memory [5] - 65:10, 151:16, 175:19,
185:1, 274:13
 men [1] - 113:15
 mention [9] - 9:25, 55:15, 55:17, 67:6,
116:15, 126:5, 133:14, 255:3, 255:4
 mentioned [40] - 13:15, 23:20, 25:16,
25:18, 50:16, 53:4, 63:1, 73:4, 73:15,
73:18, 73:19, 76:22, 79:23, 81:22,
84:13, 86:18, 88:5, 89:5, 89:12, 89:21,
90:16, 90:19, 91:22, 96:22, 128:19,
129:13, 147:24, 157:9, 161:11, 171:3,
172:20, 217:14, 243:25, 251:4, 268:8,
277:23, 282:25, 289:22, 297:10, 297:14
 mentions [1] - 195:25
 mere [1] - 50:3
 merely [5] - 50:6, 205:19, 240:23,
323:4, 323:12
 merged [3] - 164:6, 293:20, 295:21
 merger [2] - 293:19, 295:21
 mess [1] - 23:13
 message [3] - 120:25, 121:4, 141:6
 messages [2] - 78:19, 213:23
 messing [1] - 18:14
 messy [1] - 167:16
 met [2] - 243:8, 264:18
 method [5] - 88:3, 88:4, 90:4, 90:6,
90:10
 methodology [1] - 306:8
 methods [1] - 247:15
 Michael [3] - 17:8, 53:7
 microphone [1] - 15:3
 microprocessor [6] - 114:2, 115:11,
115:12, 129:5, 170:7, 255:4
 microprocessors [5] - 114:5, 127:8,
255:3, 255:14, 261:2
 Microsoft [2] - 56:10, 300:9
 middle [5] - 16:23, 23:2, 178:3, 181:11,
184:1
 midfield [3] - 35:19, 36:4
 midway [1] - 192:18
 might [42] - 6:17, 46:14, 76:5, 85:23,
92{:}15,\,109{:}11,\,122{:}17,\,127{:}5,\,128{:}17,
128:21, 154:6, 159:1, 159:15, 164:13,
168:8, 170:11, 173:20, 175:8, 183:19,
185:20, 188:18, 192:25, 213:18, 224:18,
233:21, 242:2, 247:7, 247:10, 249:12,
```

```
253:25, 254:6, 254:23, 256:16, 256:23,
257:2, 257:5, 257:7, 260:18, 267:21,
268:14, 273:25
 Mike [6] - 7:18, 27:7, 34:16, 45:17,
94:6, 304:22
 miles [2] - 136:6, 211:7
 military [5] - 21:14, 52:18, 282:22,
282:25, 283:1
 MILLIGAN [2] - 135:19, 165:11
 Milligan [33] - 28:5, 135:9, 135:22,
135:24, 135:25, 136:5, 136:8, 137:3,
138:2, 138:11, 140:23, 145:10, 146:2,
147:21, 148:2, 148:9, 148:21, 149:2,
149:13, 150:9, 151:21, 153:16, 153:23,
154:11, 155:3, 155:19, 165:13, 166:19,
168:20, 219:18, 258:6, 298:9
 MILLIKEN [2] - 155:1, 169:6
 Milliken [70] - 28:4, 28:5, 53:1, 87:17,
89:3, 94:10, 94:11, 94:13, 95:1, 95:15,
95:25, 96:3, 96:6, 96:15, 97:6, 99:16,
100:9, 105:18, 114:7, 114:14, 116:23,
117:4, 118:17, 118:19, 118:23, 119:1,
120:17, 121:6, 123:17, 123:21, 124:19,
125:5, 127:18, 129:13, 130:1, 131:9,
144:10, 144:11, 144:19, 145:7, 145:22,
146:2, 146:15, 149:4, 150:5, 150:12,
151:21, 154:13, 155:18, 155:19, 156:23,
158:24, 158:25, 160:1, 164:24, 166:19,
169:1, 169:7, 171:17, 171:22, 193:4,
241:16, 241:19, 247:16, 257:2, 271:20
 Milliken's [10] - 94:20, 98:21, 117:21,
121:24, 129:14, 129:21, 155:10, 156:16,
256:17
 million [5] - 106:12, 106:24, 109:20,
137:18, 221:22
 millions [3] - 109:19, 268:9, 268:14
 mind [4] - 46:8, 76:19, 91:25, 274:15
 mine [4] - 51:8, 57:5, 214:3, 234:17
 Mineola [1] - 21:1
 Minimum [1] - 239:22
 minimum [2] - 240:17, 289:18
 ministry [1] - 17:25
 Minton [2] - 34:17, 34:20
 minute [4] - 73:22, 81:11, 218:9, 262:7
 minutes [25] - 10:15, 29:8, 43:18,
63:17, 63:18, 63:23, 64:4, 67:22, 68:3,
84:16, 110:25, 134:15, 134:24, 169:3,
169:4, 172:22, 209:25, 266:12, 266:13,
281:6, 302:1, 324:10
 misleading [2] - 42:24, 43:19
 misremembered [1] - 251:7
 missiles [1] - 137:9
 missing [2] - 182:23, 215:5
 Mississippi [1] - 98:6
 misspoke [1] - 273:11
 mistakes [1] - 98:10
 MIT [14] - 136:11, 136:13, 136:14,
136:16, 136:23, 137:12, 212:4, 212:6,
212:12, 212:14, 212:15, 212:17, 212:22,
213:10
 mitigating [1] - 267:20
```

```
mix [1] - 215:9
 model [1] - 184:17
 module [2] - 136:21, 136:22
 mom [1] - 24:15
 moment [15] - 9:20, 11:6, 79:18, 88:23,
135:13, 281:10, 294:5, 294:12, 297:10,
299:8, 301:15, 301:24, 308:16, 315:5,
324:11
 Mona [1] - 15:12
 MONDAY [1] - 6:1
 Monday [1] - 109:25
 monetization [2] - 224:8, 321:1
 monetize [2] - 157:13, 163:15
 monetizing [1] - 161:23
 money [40] - 38:2, 40:24, 41:5, 41:9,
41:12, 42:3, 42:8, 42:11, 42:14, 43:6,
55:2, 88:12, 92:11, 100:8, 105:6, 105:8,
105:23, 105:24, 106:11, 106:15, 106:19,
106:20, 107:3, 112:2, 113:7, 152:4,
154:8, 216:6, 216:10, 219:7, 220:18,
221:20, 222:24, 224:4, 224:8, 229:21,
293:11, 293:12, 298:6, 298:7
 Monsoon [9] - 109:15, 118:13, 123:23,
124:3, 126:7, 310:23, 314:13, 315:14
 month [3] - 56:9, 272:14, 280:25
 months [6] - 170:6, 235:21, 252:6,
255:16, 255:18, 276:7
 Morgan [2] - 19:24, 19:25
 morning [32] - 6:16, 7:6, 11:10, 13:9,
13:13, 15:19, 16:12, 18:6, 18:17, 18:24,
20:13, 20:23, 21:7, 22:13, 22:22, 23:22,
26:19, 29:9, 29:18, 78:3, 78:7, 93:22,
109:25, 113:13, 125:17, 169:7, 169:8,
302:5, 302:19, 303:2, 324:7, 324:9
 Morris [5] - 18:25, 41:22, 58:1, 58:15
 most [24] - 28:24, 30:5, 47:10, 59:16,
95:5, 104:22, 130:11, 133:15, 139:2,
143:1, 145:13, 189:21, 189:23, 191:18,
197:17, 216:17, 236:25, 240:5, 240:7,
242:23, 244:3, 283:20, 288:3, 289:23
 mostly [2] - 17:11, 118:4
 mother [2] - 15:16, 144:15
 \boldsymbol{motion}~{\tiny [18]}~-6:8,~6:22,~7:11,~9:13,
303:7, 303:18, 306:7, 306:13, 306:19,
307:10, 307:23, 309:22, 312:10, 315:18,
315:23, 315:25, 321:10
 motions [1] - 295:3
 mountain [1] - 15:24
 mounted [1] - 127:8
 move [11] - 35:19, 37:20, 64:23, 65:3,
66:20, 114:24, 234:12, 235:15, 246:24,
296:4, 297:9
 moved [2] - 256:11, 282:22
 moves [1] - 164:18
 movie [4] - 212:19, 212:24, 213:2,
213:3
 moving [2] - 115:1, 126:21
 MR [256] - 6:12, 6:23, 7:4, 7:8, 7:13,
7:14, 7:18, 7:22, 7:24, 8:16, 9:1, 9:13,
10:3, 10:5, 10:7, 10:12, 10:13, 11:2,
```

11:4, 25:4, 25:6, 26:18, 27:6, 27:25, 28:10, 28:15, 29:11, 31:11, 31:14, 31:16, 31:22, 31:24, 32:3, 32:7, 32:13, 33:5, 33:9, 33:11, 33:15, 33:18, 34:4, $34{:}8,\,36{:}22,\,37{:}17,\,39{:}17,\,39{:}24,\,40{:}5,$ 40:9, 40:13, 40:20, 40:22, 41:16, 42:1, 42:5, 42:17, 42:20, 43:1, 43:9, 43:13, 43:16, 44:14, 45:15, 46:13, 46:21, 47:1, 47:5, 51:1, 51:4, 51:9, 51:12, 51:15, 51:19, 51:23, 52:2, 52:5, 52:8, 52:12, 52:16, 52:20, 52:22, 54:4, 54:7, 54:10, 54:15, 54:21, 55:6, 55:14, 56:11, 56:16, 56:18, 57:4, 57:10, 57:13, 58:11, 58:14, 58:18, 60:6, 60:9, 60:14, 60:17, 60:20, 61:3, 61:9, 61:23, 62:7, 62:13, 62:16, 62:20, 63:10, 64:8, 64:11, 64:14, 64:19, 65:6, 65:23, 66:3, 66:11, 66:23, 67:5, 67:14, 67:15, 67:19, 67:22, 68:4, 68:15, 68:20, 68:25, 69:8, 69:17, 69:20, 69:22, 69:24, 70:2, 70:6, 72:1, 72:2, 92:23, 92:24, 93:2, 93:5, 93:12, 93:15, 93:19, 113:12, 135:7, 135:12, 135:17, 135:21, 152:20, 152:23, 153:2, 153:5, 153:6, 153:10, 153:12, 153:15, 154:17, 154:18, 154:22, 155:2, 165:9, 165:12, 166:6, 166:8, 168:9, 168:11, 168:17, 168:19, 168:25, 209:19, 209:23, 210:7, 210:11, 210:13, 210:18, 234:12, 234:14, 234:18, 234:21, 239:4, 239:6, 239:14, 239:16, 239:24, 240:1, 242:25, 243:1, 243:4, 243:7, 261:5, 261:11, 262:10, 262:12, 263:8, 263:10, 263:25, 264:3, 265:16, 265:18, 265:21, 265:22, 266:10, 281:1, 281:6, 281:10, 281:13, 293:14, 294:8, 294:16, 294:25, 295:5, 295:19, 296:2, 296:19, 301:10, 301:11, 302:14, 302:25, 303:4, 303:11, 304:14, 304:20, 304:22, 305:7, 305:24, 306:2, 307:21, 308:7, 308:15, 308:19, 309:4, 309:8, 310:2, 310:9, 310:13, 313:13, 315:6, 316:4, 316:21, 317:5, 317:18, 317:21, 318:10, 318:12, 318:22, 319:1, 319:12, 319:20, 320:9, 320:23, 321:6, 322:6, 322:15, 323:23, 324:1, 324:4 **MS** [24] - 281:16, 281:20, 281:23,

MS [24] - 281:16, 281:20, 281:23, 282:4, 282:7, 294:2, 294:15, 294:17, 295:7, 296:3, 296:22, 301:6, 303:14, 305:17, 306:10, 306:16, 306:18, 306:21, 307:8, 307:19, 310:17, 312:6, 315:8, 315:11

multigigabit [1] - 146:21 multiple [18] - 125:9, 127:19, 151:17, 152:16, 153:21, 183:24, 184:11, 184:13, 192:10, 201:7, 205:12, 209:1, 209:2, 209:7, 257:25, 258:3, 298:25

must [10] - 48:16, 48:19, 88:7, 90:25, 92:6, 184:7, 189:8, 251:7, 313:18,

320:25

Mutual [2] - 17:23, 17:24 mutual [10] - 31:7, 31:17, 32:4, 64:22, 64:25, 65:1, 65:11, 65:19, 66:17, 66:19

Ν

name [75] - 11:14, 15:4, 15:5, 15:12, 15:20, 16:2, 16:7, 16:13, 16:18, 16:19, 17:3, 17:8, 17:21, 18:6, 18:7, 18:17, 18:24, 18:25, 19:8, 19:9, 19:15, 19:16, 19:23, 19:24, 20:5, 20:6, 20:13, 20:14, 20:23, 20:24, 21:7, 21:8, 21:20, 22:13, 22:23, 23:7, 23:8, 24:14, 27:6, 28:6, 28:7, 28:8, 28:16, 28:17, 45:17, 102:3, 13:13, 123:25, 124:2, 128:2, 154:22, 155:3, 172:24, 173:2, 173:3, 179:4, 210:20, 221:11, 223:22, 243:8, 243:22, 270:6, 271:20, 275:24, 275:25, 282:10, 285:9, 286:1, 292:3, 292:5, 298:20, 300:8

named [18] - 28:4, 28:5, 29:25, 34:11, 104:4, 108:22, 116:24, 116:25, 138:22, 151:21, 214:3, 238:13, 269:3, 272:18, 272:22, 272:23, 273:19, 283:16

nameless [1] - 115:21 namely [1] - 285:12

names [8] - 116:7, 116:9, 123:24, 162:19, 172:25, 243:11, 276:17

narrow [6] - 229:12, 245:21, 245:24, 246:14, 246:16, 305:13

NASA [1] - 146:19

nation's [2] - 95:13, 115:16 **National** [4] - 95:14, 115:18, 140:10,

143:24

Nations [1] - 119:18 natively [1] - 190:17

nature [3] - 25:14, 215:7, 215:8

Naval [1] - 140:9

NBC [1] - 223:25

NBX [7] - 213:13, 213:14, 213:20, 214:2, 214:6, 214:10, 226:10

near[4] - 149:17, 179:7, 234:16, 251:16 **nearing**[1] - 143:11

necessarily [6] - 54:23, 86:20, 174:23, 184:7, 257:22, 317:11

necessary [6] - 76:8, 76:12, 82:1, 174:9, 260:16, 295:1

need [48] - 7:5, 14:8, 38:19, 46:3, 61:17, 62:9, 63:3, 63:5, 63:16, 67:16, 67:21, 88:11, 89:18, 92:8, 96:21, 119:12, 120:5, 121:11, 122:2, 124:19, 129:5, 130:3, 130:18, 132:1, 132:21, 132:23, 132:24, 133:10, 134:23, 152:10, 184:2, 184:14, 185:18, 204:25, 220:11, 222:4, 227:10, 228:1, 232:13, 237:18, 250:1, 301:25, 302:2, 313:18, 314:22,

needed [5] - 62:4, 63:1, 96:8, 97:9, 127:18

318:5, 323:25, 324:8

needlework [1] - 19:6

needs [3] - 99:10, 131:14, 131:16 **nefarious** [3] - 252:21, 256:3, 256:6

negatively [2] - 37:7, 37:9

negotiate [3] - 236:8, 248:15, 252:22

negotiated [1] - 323:4

negotiates [1] - 267:10

negotiating [6] - 236:13, 237:13, 289:4, 289:21, 322:23, 323:12

negotiation [3] - 167:5, 267:23, 320:2 negotiations [10] - 161:24, 167:11, 168:1, 236:18, 257:23, 267:14, 267:24, 293:19, 294:9, 295:20

neighborhood [1] - 317:9

Neiman [1] - 18:10

nervous [1] - 46:14

nest [1] - 22:20

network [93] - 25:20, 101:17, 101:19, 114:13, 114:24, 118:7, 118:14, 118:25, 119:6, 119:8, 119:12, 119:14, 119:22, 119:25, 120:4, 120:15, 120:19, 120:21, 120:23, 121:1, 124:8, 124:9, 125:3, 125:7, 125:19, 126:3, 126:20, 126:22, 141:22, 141:23, 141:25, 151:15, 151:17, 151:19, 157:5, 158:11, 159:1, 159:4, 159:9, 159:14, 159:18, 159:19, 160:2, 160:17, 160:24, 161:7, 161:12, 161:14, 164:7, 164:14, 165:14, 165:16, 166:3, 166:20, 171:2, 175:6, 175:9, 186:5, 190:11, 196:9, 196:21, 197:14, 197:18, 198:12, 204:25, 206:18, 206:20, 207:10, 213:17, 217:16, 217:17, 245:14, 245:16, 248:19, 248:25, 249:2, 249:3, 249:12, 249:19, 251:8, 253:6, 256:16, 261:2, 261:7, 261:8, 263:14, 263:17, 263:23, 264:16. 283:23

Network [4] - 119:3, 149:15, 195:14, 213:15

networking [9] - 158:11, 158:12, 163:21, 228:7, 245:14, 245:15, 254:9, 254:11, 254:14

Networks [2] - 170:13, 171:14 networks [11] - 78:15, 132:21, 163:25, 164:2, 164:8, 251:9, 251:10, 251:11, 251:19, 255:9, 286:13

never [17] - 55:13, 144:5, 156:4, 156:9, 156:11, 156:13, 158:18, 160:4, 163:13, 170:20, 192:2, 192:6, 192:8, 255:12, 256:15, 277:13, 312:10

New [4] - 138:1, 144:17, 170:2, 171:17 new [25] - 86:13, 211:10, 215:20, 217:6, 217:23, 217:24, 218:23, 226:18, 243:2, 248:23, 268:3, 306:14, 306:23, 308:10, 309:2, 312:3, 312:11, 312:12, 312:24, 313:1, 313:3, 313:9, 313:11, 315:13, 315:19

news [3] - 60:13, 60:15, 79:8 newspaper [1] - 53:21

next [45] - 13:13, 23:21, 27:20, 37:19, 48:1, 53:12, 71:11, 73:17, 80:7, 80:25, 81:6, 95:19, 104:4, 117:4, 121:20,

nowhere [2] - 101:20, 279:17

145:12, 148:17, 149:23, 168:23, 175:25, 176:1, 183:12, 194:24, 196:6, 227:7, 229:15, 232:22, 233:13, 239:25, 250:20, 250:25, 251:18, 251:20, 255:23, 264:12, 266:9, 270:19, 273:6, 273:14, 273:15, 281:5, 288:13, 291:21, 292:23, 300:4 next-to-the-last [1] - 255:23 nice [4] - 39:3, 243:9, 243:10, 286:1 **night** [2] - 6:9, 306:22 nine [1] - 267:6 nineteen [1] - 266:13 Nineties [3] - 142:7, 144:21, 146:16 nitpicking [1] - 48:21 nobody [7] - 30:9, 31:6, 33:1, 36:11, 38:7, 44:23, 168:2 nobody's [1] - 320:19 nodes [2] - 141:8, 184:25 Nokia [1] - 300:9 non [9] - 112:7, 114:20, 115:4, 126:19, 127:22, 130:10, 272:16, 273:24, 277:5 non-infringement [5] - 114:20, 115:4, 126:19, 127:22, 130:10 non-infringing [1] - 112:7 non-lawyers [3] - 272:16, 273:24, 277:5 nondisclosure [1] - 277:14 none [2] - 96:25, 168:15 noninterest [1] - 167:2 normally [4] - 11:15, 81:23, 140:18, 177:4 northeast [1] - 144:16 northwest [1] - 211:7 Northwestern [2] - 17:23, 17:24 note [11] - 81:12, 98:23, 195:7, 229:15, 269:20, 269:23, 269:24, 270:8, 270:9, 270:10, 279:17 notebook [6] - 100:12, 148:2, 250:13, 254:18, 287:11, 287:12 notebooks [9] - 79:16, 79:18, 79:19, 79:20, 79:22, 81:15, 88:22, 154:19, 243:2 noted [2] - 171:22, 205:19 notes [6] - 81:6, 81:12, 81:16, 81:17, 81:18, 81:19 **NOTES** [1] - 6:1 $\textbf{nothing} \ {\tiny [14]} - 44:13, \ 44:14, \ 45:12,$

47:17, 74:21, 96:5, 126:18, 156:22,

320:16

Notice [1] - 248:1

noticed [1] - 8:22

notion [1] - 208:1

278:8, 280:6, 280:19

Novy [2] - 93:25, 286:2

132:11, 307:25, 310:18

notwithstanding [1] - 314:2

166:3, 168:11, 256:3, 261:8, 265:18,

notice [12] - 6:8, 86:9, 90:2, 101:7,

122:3, 123:12, 123:24, 124:20, 126:12,

November [11] - 112:11, 116:18, 171:9,

232:9, 250:21, 269:18, 275:15, 275:19,

NPE [1] - 124:7 number [39] - 14:20, 24:6, 44:25, 47:4, 53:2, 53:13, 65:8, 75:24, 84:25, 88:25, 100:1, 100:13, 144:23, 157:1, 161:24, 171:16, 172:3, 172:13, 172:15, 178:8, 178:13, 194:3, 198:21, 200:5, 218:19, 223:1, 226:5, 228:2, 228:20, 236:8, 238:16, 247:3, 251:13, 252:1, 252:3, 285:24, 295:17, 318:18 Number [141] - 4:18, 14:25, 15:3, 15:5, 15:11, 15:20, 16:3, 16:19, 17:3, 17:9, 17:13, 17:21, 18:7, 19:9, 19:16, 19:24, 20:6, 22:4, 24:7, 24:15, 24:19, 26:5, 32:8, 32:14, 33:19, 37:10, 37:13, 37:14, 40:6, 40:15, 41:17, 41:18, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 41:22, 44:10, 44:11, 44:12, 47:6, 50:23, 51:5, 51:13, 52:3, 52:5, 52:13, 54:9, 54:17, 54:22, 55:8, 56:8, 56:12, 57:2, 57:25, 58:1, 58:3, 58:9, 58:11, 58:15, 58:19, 58:21, 58:22, 59:1, 59:10, 59:11, 59:13, 59:25, 60:22, 61:19, 61:25, 62:14, 62:20, 64:16, 64:17, 64:21, 64:24, 65:7, 65:9, 66:4, 66:5, 68:16, 69:7, 69:10, 69:11, 71:7, 71:9, 71:11, 71:13, 71:15, 71:17, 71:19, 71:21, 100:22, 100:23, 104:22, 107:21, 107:22, 117:22, 123:14, 149:18, 149:24, 150:18, 220:6, 234:19, 235:7, 259:11, 259:13, 264:1, 266:21, 269:10, 271:16, 271:18, 275:13, 277:22, 278:12, 280:20, 299:14, 299:15, 305:8, 305:11 numbered [4] - 89:14, 89:15, 89:19, 174:10 numbers [10] - 35:8, 68:10, 69:25, 71:3, 79:24, 89:15, 252:9, 288:18, 302:18 numeric [1] - 251:25 numerical [3] - 252:12, 252:14, 264:22 nurse [3] - 18:14, 19:1, 19:19 nutshell [1] - 121:23

0

O'Neill [1] - 53:6
oath [7] - 38:16, 72:13, 72:14, 135:10,
210:10, 266:22, 281:15
object [9] - 67:9, 75:15, 88:14, 261:6,
261:9, 293:14, 293:24, 295:20, 295:25
objected [2] - 75:23, 321:13
objecting [1] - 320:19
objection [17] - 8:24, 9:14, 25:4, 64:7,
64:8, 64:11, 67:13, 75:20, 152:20,
153:2, 153:10, 166:6, 296:20, 301:8,
301:10, 301:11, 320:22
objections [5] - 8:9, 25:1, 71:24, 75:16,
92:22
obtained [2] - 87:16, 87:17

308:5, 308:8, 308:13, 308:21, 308:24, 309:19, 310:21, 311:3, 311:9, 311:17, 314:15, 315:16, 315:22 **obviously** [3] - 70:2, 318:1, 318:18 obviousness [14] - 306:24, 309:7, 309:23, 310:12, 310:19, 311:7, 311:13, 312:12, 312:17, 314:5, 314:19, 315:13, 316:5, 316:8 occasion [1] - 76:17 occasionally [2] - 191:4, 191:14 occupation [4] - 15:15, 16:3, 17:23, occurred [3] - 57:22, 179:23, 260:15 ocean [1] - 137:1 **OF** [14] - 4:1, 135:19, 135:20, 155:1, 165:11, 169:6, 210:16, 210:17, 243:6, 262:11, 266:15, 281:21, 281:22, 324:16 offended [1] - 82:17 offer [18] - 94:23, 163:15, 236:3, 278:4, 278:18, 278:23, 279:12, 279:25, 280:1, 281:1, 302:15, 303:24, 307:13, 312:12, 313:3, 316:1, 316:5 offered [9] - 73:24, 158:5, 161:20, 235:2, 278:9, 302:21, 306:3, 310:21, 311:6 offering [9] - 83:15, 87:23, 98:23, 157:15, 157:18, 255:5, 312:11, 317:18, 323:2 Offers [1] - 270:24 offers [5] - 257:25, 258:3, 258:4, 278:13, 279:24 offhand [2] - 190:6, 205:11 **Office** [26] - 35:23, 49:8, 56:23, 56:24, 83:6, 84:8, 85:13, 94:19, 96:1, 97:15, 99:18, 99:25, 113:4, 114:11, 115:19, 117:13, 119:3, 119:6, 125:14, 125:18, 140:9, 173:24, 246:24, 283:13, 284:19, 299:17 office [6] - 20:8, 21:10, 26:20, 138:3, 213:18, 269:13 officer [12] - 11:25, 17:10, 20:7, 138:13, 138:15, 138:16, 138:18, 139:8, 145:5, 146:24, 168:13, 219:19 officers [1] - 66:15 offices [2] - 138:4, 138:5 official [1] - 173:2 often [6] - 12:8, 14:1, 72:7, 202:18, 230:21, 284:13 oil [1] - 17:14 old [7] - 117:6, 117:7, 135:25, 136:1, 211:2, 211:3, 282:12 oldest [2] - 16:22, 23:1 Olin [5] - 26:22, 53:5, 94:1, 281:16, 282:4 OLIN [11] - 281:16, 281:20, 281:23, 282:4, 282:7, 294:2, 294:15, 294:17, 295:7, 296:3, 296:22 omission [1] - 245:11 ON [4] - 135:20, 210:17, 281:22, 324:14 once [8] - 12:22, 128:3, 164:20, 184:15,

```
184:16, 228:12, 246:22, 305:11
 One [1] - 177:10
 one [249] - 8:17, 9:10, 10:14, 12:4,
13:23, 14:9, 15:15, 15:16, 16:5, 16:14,
16:22, 16:23, 16:24, 17:4, 17:24, 17:25,
18:12, 18:13, 18:19, 18:20, 20:2, 21:2,
21:13, 21:15, 21:23, 21:24, 22:6, 22:17,
22:18, 23:12, 27:1, 28:23, 35:14, 37:1,
37:19, 40:24, 41:7, 43:24, 45:3, 45:21,
45:24, 46:19, 48:5, 50:1, 50:2, 51:23,
55:1, 55:21, 56:3, 56:25, 57:11, 59:5,
65:12, 67:7, 69:25, 70:15, 70:20, 74:22,
75:14, 75:20, 79:24, 80:10, 81:7, 81:22,
82:12, 83:17, 86:15, 86:22, 95:18,
95:19, 95:23, 97:7, 97:18, 97:19, 99:20,
99:22, 100:16, 101:7, 103:18, 105:18,
106:16, 108:11, 108:12, 109:14, 110:21,
110:22, 111:4, 111:8, 111:13, 111:21,
111:23, 111:25, 112:1, 116:11, 116:12,
118:12, 118:13, 120:1, 120:23, 120:24,
121:4, 121:17, 121:19, 122:9, 122:10,
123:15, 124:4, 124:14, 126:5, 126:21,
126:23, 127:2, 127:15, 127:20, 127:25,
128:18, 129:22, 129:23, 130:25, 131:3,
132:7, 132:8, 132:17, 132:22, 132:23,
132:25, 135:12, 137:13, 139:3, 141:20,
142:10, 143:1, 143:15, 145:11, 146:4,
147:9, 148:3, 149:20, 151:14, 151:16,
151:21, 154:23, 155:4, 155:13, 159:16,
160:13, 160:15, 171:19, 172:3, 175:5,
175:14, 178:24, 181:4, 181:15, 181:24,
184:20, 184:21, 187:24, 190:14, 192:14,
193:17, 195:4, 196:19, 196:20, 196:22,
197:1, 197:6, 199:14, 199:18, 206:1,
208:22, 209:16, 212:7, 213:1, 213:5,
213:7, 213:17, 215:21, 216:14, 217:4,
220:25, 226:19, 230:20, 231:18, 232:9,
234:3, 234:23, 234:24, 236:5, 236:6,
237:1, 237:19, 243:19, 245:21, 245:22,
246:9, 246:21, 250:17, 250:18, 251:4,
251:19, 255:1, 256:22, 257:10, 257:15,
259:7, 261:12, 262:15, 264:13, 267:22,
268:13, 270:25, 271:12, 271:23, 272:22,
275:8, 276:25, 278:14, 279:10, 280:24,
281:10, 283:24, 286:10, 286:16, 289:17,
289:22, 290:2, 291:5, 296:5, 298:20,
304:12, 306:15, 310:6, 310:19, 311:2,
315:9, 316:22, 317:23, 318:17, 319:8,
319:25
 one-hundredth [2] - 111:21, 111:23
 one-time [3] - 289:17, 289:22, 290:2
 ones [25] - 31:1, 34:18, 69:2, 69:4,
69:12, 69:14, 69:21, 82:16, 85:2, 106:3,
120:22, 122:14, 125:25, 139:3, 142:10,
185:22, 196:20, 196:22, 199:18, 229:14,
230:4, 233:10, 233:11, 252:18, 302:22
```

ongoing [9] - 154:6, 162:4, 191:5, 233:20, 233:24, 236:16, 236:17, 240:17, 240:25 online [4] - 98:3, 98:4, 229:1, 284:4

open [10] - 63:25, 68:7, 76:14, 76:19,

```
126:25, 135:2, 174:25, 210:3, 270:14,
302:7
```

Open [1] - 6:4 open-ended [1] - 126:25

opening [9] - 7:21, 7:24, 13:2, 13:4, 68:2, 72:18, 73:5, 74:24, 92:19

operate [1] - 186:25

operates [2] - 56:23, 183:1

operating [2] - 220:17, 221:18

operation [20] - 25:22, 122:5, 122:7, 124:24, 125:1, 131:17, 132:15, 178:17, 179:21, 180:22, 180:23, 181:4, 181:6, 181:7, 181:8, 183:11, 183:18, 184:4,

184:11, 314:1

operations [6] - 178:22, 190:16, 194:15, 194:20, 194:21, 221:10

ophthalmic [1] - 16:20

opine [4] - 9:2, 315:21, 317:6, 319:16

opined [3] - 305:18, 319:5, 319:15

opines [2] - 106:13, 317:12

opinion [21] - 46:18, 53:24, 61:1, 152:20, 153:11, 303:19, 305:4, 307:13, 310:19, 310:21, 311:6, 311:13, 311:18, 312:12, 312:16, 315:13, 315:15, 316:5, 317:19, 317:23, 318:13

opinions [19] - 37:3, 44:5, 44:8, 53:23, 75:19, 112:7, 306:14, 307:4, 313:3, 313:11, 315:19, 316:1, 318:1, 318:3, 318:7, 320:6, 320:7, 323:3

opportunities [2] - 216:14, 217:20 Opportunities [1] - 259:18 opportunity [14] - 10:20, 12:22, 30:8, 73:11, 77:8, 82:24, 136:17, 215:23, 216:12, 216:18, 278:9, 313:2, 313:8,

opposed [6] - 10:25, 189:11, 192:5, 201:6, 234:2, 320:2

opposition [1] - 309:21

Optical [1] - 195:14

optical [2] - 195:17, 245:15

optimal [2] - 139:4, 139:5

Optimized [1] - 119:4

option [2] - 133:17, 309:17

orally [1] - 255:12

Order [1] - 302:17

order [21] - 12:15, 38:20, 46:2, 48:15, 75:3, 83:7, 128:19, 213:22, 220:11, 241:23, 251:21, 251:23, 251:25, 252:1, 252:4, 252:5, 264:23, 265:5, 306:11, 318:13

ordered [1] - 313:17

orders [1] - 295:4

ordinary [2] - 86:15, 311:10

Oregon [1] - 26:6

organization [1] - 44:21

organizations [2] - 44:17, 44:19

oriented [1] - 145:16

original [6] - 157:15, 173:22, 174:16,

179:22, 252:6, 287:6

originally [7] - 96:18, 101:14, 141:9,

```
170:24, 204:20, 272:6, 291:3
 Oso [1] - 50:14
 otherwise [6] - 147:14, 218:5, 219:7,
242:17, 275:17, 320:6
 ought [10] - 10:10, 48:22, 48:23,
```

121:13, 125:13, 129:3, 248:18, 253:15, 319:9

ourselves [3] - 12:9, 142:5, 206:23

outcome [2] - 154:1, 227:16

outdoors [4] - 15:9, 15:25, 17:6, 17:11

outpatient [1] - 22:15

output [6] - 110:17, 110:20, 176:8,

207:6, 207:10, 209:17

outright [1] - 65:25

outset [1] - 314:11

outside [16] - 39:4, 76:9, 127:13, 145:18, 145:19, 182:7, 188:18, 191:4, 202:9, 261:1, 277:1, 277:3, 277:4,

277:12, 295:23, 301:21

overall [1] - 146:8 overrule [1] - 75:20

overruled [5] - 153:4, 153:14, 166:7, 261:10, 321:12

overseeing [1] - 139:11

owe [1] - 50:8

owed [2] - 49:23, 50:5

own [38] - 12:8, 25:16, 30:11, 30:19, 31:5, 31:17, 37:3, 39:8, 48:12, 65:11, 65:19, 65:25, 94:15, 97:10, 102:6, 111:10, 111:11, 111:17, 131:23, 152:18, 152:25, 166:21, 221:17, 222:13, 225:9, 225:12, 230:21, 242:14, 242:15, 242:16, 242:19, 242:22, 247:4, 284:23, 298:24, 299:2

owned [8] - 64:22, 66:5, 89:5, 137:6, 137:16, 137:19, 216:22, 237:1 owner [5] - 83:19, 89:23, 257:14, 285:25, 299:17

owner's [2] - 83:18, 89:22 owners [3] - 27:1, 93:24, 286:4 ownership [6] - 137:20, 167:13, 216:20, 218:23, 236:20, 288:25 owning [1] - 22:10

owns [6] - 96:3, 105:1, 114:22, 137:5, 153:23, 299:4

Ρ

p.m [8] - 135:1, 210:2, 277:25, 302:6, 324:12

Pacific [2] - 303:20, 304:17

package [6] - 102:15, 102:17, 104:2,

158:14, 220:16, 222:14

packaged [1] - 215:12

Packard [4] - 55:1, 56:6, 128:14, 130.14

Packet [2] - 119:4, 197:16 packet [11] - 130:23, 131:3, 131:4, 152:17, 157:2, 159:21, 164:19, 171:1, 197:14, 217:16, 270:13

```
Packet-Over-SONET [1] - 197:16
 packets [11] - 129:18, 157:8, 165:20,
165:22, 165:23, 165:25, 166:5, 166:10,
166:11, 166:14
 PAGE [1] - 4:2
 page [44] - 89:1, 89:8, 103:15, 103:16,
103:17, 149:23, 193:24, 194:9, 194:11,
194:24, 223:13, 228:14, 234:15, 234:16,
234:18, 239:4, 239:17, 239:25, 243:20,
250:20, 251:17, 251:18, 251:20, 259:3,
259:16, 259:17, 271:4, 271:5, 271:6,
271:8, 271:10, 271:11, 271:15, 271:16,
280:12, 288:17, 288:19, 288:21, 294:18,
296:11, 311:14
 pages [6] - 103:14, 200:4, 228:17,
250:25, 255:7, 259:2
 paid [18] - 42:15, 55:1, 55:4, 88:20,
105:6, 105:13, 106:15, 106:17, 111:22,
112:1, 137:18, 140:18, 140:20, 204:9,
260:1, 295:10, 300:22
 Palestine [1] - 20:17
 Palm [1] - 231:7
 Pam [1] - 272:22
 Pamela [1] - 275:14
 panel [14] - 6:7, 10:11, 10:17, 11:6,
11:11, 12:16, 23:17, 24:3, 25:10, 27:16,
28:20, 45:16, 63:13, 71:1
 paper [2] - 81:12, 117:9
 papers [2] - 86:2, 306:19
 paragraph [17] - 177:9, 178:3, 180:11,
180:13, 180:15, 180:16, 181:11, 182:8,
190:21, 194:10, 194:15, 232:13, 232:14,
232:22, 233:13, 255:23, 270:20
 paragraphs [3] - 174:11, 311:4, 312:15
 parallel [5] - 103:19, 179:3, 179:4,
179:5, 311:1
 parent [1] - 163:24
 park [1] - 15:23
 Parker [3] - 34:22, 34:23, 35:1
 parking [1] - 16:4
 parol [3] - 293:17, 293:21, 295:24
 parse [1] - 197:23
 part [64] - 13:19, 14:11, 14:14, 19:10,
20:16, 23:9, 30:5, 49:6, 63:7, 70:21,
73:8, 76:13, 79:11, 84:9, 84:15, 84:16,
85:24, 88:7, 89:10, 103:12, 116:6,
118:7, 131:9, 132:4, 139:25, 154:9,
157:13, 157:15, 157:17, 159:9, 161:7,
169:11, 174:2, 175:14, 179:8, 180:21,
180:22, 181:2, 181:11, 181:20, 195:15,
199:9, 200:18, 209:7, 212:22, 219:5,
219:6, 252:6, 254:25, 267:24, 274:8,
274:18, 274:25, 276:24, 291:2, 303:19,
303:21, 304:16, 308:25, 310:24, 311:7,
312:22, 313:4, 315:24
 part-time [3] - 19:10, 20:16, 23:9
 parte [1] - 85:22
 partial [1] - 61:21
```

partially [1] - 191:21

participate [2] - 125:24, 265:11

```
participated [3] - 70:25, 155:15, 199:6
 participation [2] - 12:14, 240:25
 particular [34] - 60:3, 65:20, 75:6,
80:24, 97:3, 99:10, 106:6, 114:5,
114:23, 121:16, 152:10, 159:19, 172:3,
172:19, 183:10, 196:7, 196:13, 197:23,
199:18, 202:16, 213:1, 216:7, 240:11,
242:1, 250:4, 284:18, 291:7, 291:13,
293:10, 299:8, 299:13, 299:18, 300:13
 particularly [2] - 45:23, 77:24
 parties [28] - 6:4, 39:3, 55:16, 63:25,
68:7, 74:13, 74:17, 74:19, 77:15, 79:7,
79:12, 79:25, 80:17, 87:9, 87:15, 90:17,
90:23, 105:25, 134:19, 135:2, 210:3,
225:22, 295:1, 295:3, 300:21, 302:7,
315:12, 322:1
 partly [1] - 201:8
 partner [3] - 26:22, 284:8, 284:21
 partners [2] - 216:6, 285:17
 partnership [1] - 297:23
 Partridge [2] - 186:3, 186:4
 parts [4] - 62:25, 237:3, 244:7, 288:6
 partway [2] - 183:19, 194:11
 party [5] - 13:1, 75:15, 76:17, 162:14,
313:15
 party's [1] - 268:19
 Pasadena [1] - 23:2
 pass [12] - 78:1, 82:8, 82:13, 154:17,
168:9, 168:12, 242:25, 243:2, 265:16,
266:4, 301:6, 318:10
 passage [8] - 177:10, 178:4, 179:7,
179:18, 179:24, 180:18, 182:8, 308:19
 password [1] - 128:21
 past [13] - 35:19, 36:4, 97:17, 105:9,
106:22, 112:3, 211:19, 217:4, 217:5,
294:22, 295:10, 301:18, 323:14
 patent [296] - 6:25, 8:22, 9:4, 25:15,
25:16, 37:24, 38:3, 41:3, 41:4, 41:10,
41:11, 42:7, 42:25, 43:3, 43:4, 43:6,
46:16, 48:7, 48:12, 49:5, 49:6, 49:9,
49:12, 49:13, 49:18, 50:16, 57:1, 57:14,
62:25, 67:11, 73:21, 73:23, 74:1, 74:2,
79:24, 80:1, 80:2, 80:3, 80:4, 80:12,
80:13, 80:16, 80:24, 81:3, 83:8, 83:10,
83:11, 83:13, 83:15, 83:18, 83:19,
83:20, 83:22, 83:23, 84:1, 84:3, 84:6,
84:8, 84:9, 84:10, 84:11, 84:16, 84:22,
84:23, 84:25, 85:3, 85:15, 85:16, 85:20,
85:22, 85:23, 85:24, 86:1, 86:3, 86:5,
86:8, 86:10, 86:11, 86:12, 86:13, 86:17,
86:19, 86:21, 87:2, 87:3, 87:5, 87:16,
88:2, 88:18, 88:20, 88:24, 88:25, 89:2,
89:8, 89:9, 89:11, 89:18, 89:20, 89:22,
89:23, 89:25, 90:4, 90:12, 91:9, 99:16,
99:17, 99:20, 99:25, 100:7, 100:19,
109:6, 109:9, 111:15, 114:16, 117:4,
117:21, 118:22, 119:7, 121:11, 121:25,
124:15, 125:12, 125:16, 149:14, 150:10,
150:11, 150:19, 150:20, 150:23, 150:24,
150:25, 152:11, 153:18, 159:14, 159:17,
160:1, 161:16, 164:24, 165:4, 165:5,
```

165:15, 171:15, 171:19, 172:12, 173:7, 173:14, 173:21, 174:10, 174:17, 174:22, 174:25, 176:16, 178:12, 182:24, 185:4, 188:23, 189:1, 189:15, 192:17, 193:6, 193:18, 193:21, 198:8, 202:5, 202:9, 202:10, 202:16, 202:17, 202:19, 202:22, 205:5, 205:7, 206:16, 207:19, 218:17, 218:25, 219:4, 219:10, 219:14, 219:15, 219:19, 219:21, 220:1, 220:25, 224:19, 225:17, 226:11, 228:14, 228:15, 228:17, 229:8, 229:12, 231:22, 233:16, 233:22, 234:24, 236:10, 236:11, 238:2, 238:3, 241:17, 245:1, 246:19, 246:23, 247:21, 248:2, 248:18, 248:23, 249:5, 249:9, 249:21, 252:1, 255:13, 260:20, 261:19, 262:17, 265:7, 265:13, 267:10, 268:3, 268:7, 268:13, 268:20, 268:24, 269:2, 269:4, 270:5, 270:11, 270:22, 271:18, 272:4, 272:6, 272:19, 273:3, 273:8, 273:19, 274:7, 278:9, 283:11, 284:24, 285:1, 285:2, 285:13, 285:23, 287:16, 287:18, 287:20, 287:24, 288:9, 288:10, 290:21, 290:24, 291:1, 291:2, 291:13, 291:15, 296:23, 296:24, 297:10, 297:12, 297:13, 298:25, 299:9, 299:10, 299:13, 307:3, 316:23, 317:12, 318:17, 319:19, 320:15, 320:18 Patent [29] - 35:22, 49:8, 56:23, 56:24, 81:1, 83:6, 84:8, 85:13, 94:19, 96:1, 97:14, 99:18, 99:24, 113:4, 114:11, 115:19, 117:13, 119:2, 119:6, 125:14, 125:18, 173:24, 239:7, 239:11, 246:24, 283:12, 284:19, 288:15, 299:16 patented [12] - 25:24, 48:11, 83:14, 83:16, 88:4, 94:21, 209:11, 221:24, 224:4, 247:5, 305:14, 305:21 patenting [1] - 286:19 patents [330] - 6:25, 25:19, 25:23, 35:22, 35:23, 48:9, 49:3, 49:15, 52:25, 57:6, 57:9, 73:21, 73:25, 79:7, 79:23, 80:6, 83:3, 83:5, 84:24, 85:10, 87:15, 91:11, 94:18, 96:1, 97:15, 99:8, 99:21, 100:2, 100:8, 102:5, 105:1, 105:17, 106:2, 106:4, 106:23, 107:1, 107:7, 108:18, 109:7, 110:11, 112:6, 112:11, 112:13, 112:15, 112:16, 112:23, 113:4, 114:7, 114:12, 114:18, 114:21, 114:23, 115:19, 116:18, 116:21, 116:22, 117:13, 118:8, 118:24, 119:9, 123:18, 124:10, 124:22, 125:22, 126:15, 126:17, 128:19, 129:13, 129:17, 129:21, 130:2, 131:10, 133:6, 138:23, 138:24, 139:1, 149:7, 150:14, 150:23, 151:7, 151:9, 151:13, 151:22, 152:11, 152:14, 152:15, 152:24, 153:9, 154:5, 156:13, 157:4, 157:9, 157:14, 157:22, 158:4, 158:5, 158:6, 158:19, 161:19, 161:22, 162:1, 162:13, 163:16, 163:25, 164:13, 164:14, 166:16, 167:3, 167:8, 167:17, 167:20, 168:3, 172:4, 172:6, 173:11, 174:7, 192:22,

193:10, 193:17, 199:25, 211:25, 218:17,

```
218:18. 218:21. 218:22. 218:25. 219:3.
219:8, 219:11, 219:22, 220:1, 220:7,
220:12, 220:16, 220:22, 221:5, 223:1,
223:6, 223:20, 224:9, 224:14, 224:23,
225:3, 225:4, 225:13, 225:17, 227:7,
227:21, 227:25, 228:6, 228:7, 228:8,
228:12, 228:19, 228:22, 229:7, 229:8,
229:9, 229:13, 229:18, 230:1, 230:2,
230:11, 230:14, 230:21, 230:24, 231:14,
231:21, 232:24, 233:1, 233:2, 233:3,
233:24, 234:5, 234:23, 236:2, 236:9,
236{:}14,\,236{:}21,\,236{:}25,\,237{:}5,\,238{:}1,
238:6, 238:8, 239:13, 240:23, 241:2,
241:5, 241:9, 241:21, 241:25, 245:20,
245:21, 245:25, 246:4, 246:5, 246:13,
247:11, 247:17, 247:19, 251:1, 251:3,
251:11, 251:24, 252:3, 252:13, 253:14,
254:6, 256:18, 256:21, 257:16, 257:25,
258:1, 259:20, 259:24, 260:18, 260:24,
260:25, 261:1, 264:22, 268:9, 268:14,
269:1, 269:2, 270:14, 270:25, 271:1,
272:1, 274:4, 274:18, 275:3, 276:9,
278:10, 278:14, 278:15, 278:19, 278:23,
279:11, 279:22, 280:3, 280:5, 280:7,
280:9, 280:11, 280:12, 280:18, 283:12,
283:17, 283:19, 285:13, 285:14, 285:15,
285:18, 285:20, 286:8, 286:21, 286:22,
287:1, 287:3, 287:7, 287:22, 288:7,
288:10, 288:22, 289:1, 289:5, 289:12,
289:13, 290:3, 290:6, 290:7, 290:11,
290:12, 290:13, 290:15, 290:24, 291:20,
292:11, 292:20, 293:13, 295:11, 295:14,
296:9, 296:12, 296:15, 296:25, 297:3,
297:4, 297:24, 298:1, 298:4, 298:10,
298:12, 298:15, 298:18, 298:23, 298:24,
299:3, 299:6, 299:15, 300:14, 300:16,
300:18, 300:19, 300:22, 300:25, 301:2,
317:10, 317:24, 318:13, 319:2, 319:3,
319:15, 320:1, 320:2, 320:8, 320:13,
321:1, 321:4, 322:11, 323:21
 path [3] - 110:18, 110:20, 111:7
 pathways [1] - 127:14
 patience [1] - 55:7
 patriot [1] - 137:9
 pattern [1] - 194:21
 pattern-matching [1] - 194:21
 pause [1] - 79:18
 pay [30] - 40:24, 41:3, 41:9, 41:10,
42:8, 42:15, 77:10, 81:20, 109:4,
111:16, 111:19, 113:5, 113:6, 137:17,
152:5, 203:11, 203:15, 224:19, 224:22,
229:22, 246:23, 247:23, 261:17, 262:1,
284:17, 294:21, 296:8, 296:12, 300:24
 paying [7] - 203:4, 203:7, 229:14,
244:8, 284:15, 284:20, 289:11
 Payment [3] - 239:19, 239:22
 payment [13] - 240:19, 240:20, 240:24,
289:5, 289:16, 289:18, 289:23, 290:2,
317:8, 317:10, 321:24, 322:2
 PCM [1] - 187:12
 PCM-TDM [1] - 187:12
```

```
peers [1] - 219:17
 pending [6] - 218:17, 218:22, 218:25,
232:25, 283:17, 286:20
 pennies [1] - 105:15
 penny [1] - 105:18
 people [59] - 11:20, 30:10, 30:25,
37:22, 39:6, 43:22, 43:25, 44:1, 44:5,
44:9, 48:12, 90:2, 95:4, 109:3, 116:3,
119:20, 129:5, 134:5, 138:6, 138:7,
144:6, 144:8, 144:23, 145:18, 157:3,
163:20, 172:3, 172:5, 172:13, 172:16,
173:1, 188:8, 205:20, 223:17, 228:25,
229:24, 237:18, 244:7, 246:4, 247:3,
247:9, 247:14, 252:25, 253:8, 254:22,
258:10, 259:24, 260:13, 260:15, 260:22,
272:14, 273:23, 273:24, 274:5, 274:6,
276:14, 276:25, 321:3
 people's [2] - 234:7, 268:6
 per [1] - 170:20
 percent [33] - 48:22, 62:4, 62:5, 62:22,
63:2, 63:4, 63:6, 63:7, 105:12, 105:21,
106:8, 106:11, 106:17, 106:18, 111:21,
111:23, 111:24, 113:7, 140:17, 154:6,
154:10, 157:10, 162:5, 240:12, 240:13,
258:12, 289:14, 303:9, 304:7, 304:13,
306:9
 percentage [8] - 106:16, 106:19, 107:2,
140:13, 140:14, 240:8, 240:10, 257:20
 peremptories [3] - 67:18, 68:12, 68:24
 peremptory [1] - 64:4
 perfect [1] - 125:16
 perform [9] - 25:21, 122:7, 124:25,
132:15, 148:10, 181:5, 184:12, 206:9,
220:11
 performance [1] - 138:21
 performed [9] - 122:5, 124:24, 131:17,
180:23, 181:9, 183:18, 183:24, 190:16,
194.15
 performing [3] - 184:4, 268:3, 286:11
 perhaps [3] - 119:17, 126:22, 258:5
 period [9] - 128:12, 171:6, 186:9,
189:16, 191:3, 274:13, 276:9, 277:11,
280:25
 Perma [1] - 22:16
 permanently [1] - 201:24
 permissible [3] - 75:13, 294:14, 321:20
 permission [14] - 42:7, 42:10, 67:12,
78:10, 78:13, 83:18, 83:21, 88:18,
88:20, 88:21, 94:22, 291:24, 292:11,
300:14
 permitting [1] - 75:21
 person [14] - 30:16, 30:17, 38:3, 38:19,
39:12, 56:25, 60:21, 86:25, 94:14,
97:14, 119:19, 172:8, 265:6, 311:10
 personal [4] - 13:25, 30:19, 56:21,
 personally [10] - 38:3, 56:3, 109:20,
```

```
petroleum [1] - 20:1
 phase [3] - 73:4, 73:7, 171:12
 PhD [7] - 103:3, 118:6, 136:24, 169:21,
212:15, 213:11, 213:12
 phone [12] - 54:25, 213:16, 213:17,
213:18, 226:1, 226:2, 238:22, 280:14,
283:22, 283:25, 289:7, 289:9
 phones [2] - 78:21, 213:23
 phrase [3] - 97:5, 177:15, 177:22
 phrased [1] - 43:9
 physical [3] - 22:14, 251:9, 273:17
 physically [1] - 302:20
 physics [2] - 212:7, 214:4
 pick [3] - 46:7, 193:19, 280:14
 picked [1] - 141:20
 picking [1] - 129:22
 picture [3] - 176:19, 181:1, 182:16
 pictures [4] - 20:21, 81:5, 81:8, 287:25
 piece [2] - 125:12, 207:17
 pieces [8] - 108:24, 146:9, 146:11,
146:12, 172:14, 176:13, 183:18, 187:22
 pinned [1] - 189:22
 pins [1] - 129:7
 pioneered [2] - 114:1, 115:12
 place [15] - 71:4, 71:8, 71:10, 71:12,
71:14, 71:16, 71:18, 71:20, 71:22, 81:5,
81:18, 85:21, 86:7, 92:14, 187:19
 places [3] - 94:3, 122:25, 260:17
 PLAINTIFF [3] - 135:20, 210:17, 281:22
 plaintiff [24] - 6:13, 11:3, 13:1, 25:2,
25:15, 25:17, 35:15, 36:6, 50:12, 64:15,
67:20, 73:19, 91:10, 100:2, 135:5,
135:9, 169:1, 169:3, 210:8, 266:13,
266:18, 281:13, 281:17, 282:5
 Plaintiff's [39] - 4:3, 4:4, 4:5, 4:6, 4:7,
4:8, 4:9, 4:10, 4:11, 4:12, 4:13, 4:14,
4:15, 4:16, 4:17, 4:19, 4:20, 4:21, 4:22,
148:5, 148:18, 149:10, 150:8, 150:17,
150:18, 152:9, 153:24, 230:7, 230:8,
230:13, 231:24, 234:10, 235:15, 239:2,
254:16, 263:7
 plaintiff's [5] - 81:5, 81:9, 163:1,
250:12, 250:14
 plaintiffs [6] - 7:23, 245:5, 245:7,
245:8, 245:10, 245:12
 plan [14] - 216:15, 303:8, 307:23,
308:9, 308:10, 309:11, 309:15, 310:4,
310:10, 313:21, 313:25, 316:4, 316:8,
316:12
 Planet [1] - 167:15
 planner [2] - 17:23, 17:24
 planning [4] - 13:11, 139:5, 302:12,
308:4
 plans [2] - 9:16, 27:22
 platform [3] - 156:4, 159:9, 161:7
 play [5] - 13:19, 16:15, 49:12, 285:10,
312:3
 Player [2] - 93:25, 286:3
 player [1] - 213:1
 playing [2] - 18:21, 311:23
```

142:25, 144:1, 149:2, 200:2, 203:5,

persuade [2] - 91:7, 246:24

perspective [3] - 66:4, 236:15, 257:7

222:20, 289:9

```
pleases [2] - 9:8, 303:12
 pleasure [1] - 113:14
 plug [1] - 226:3
 plus [1] - 211:21
 pocket [1] - 106:9
 podium [1] - 303:16
 point [32] - 13:23, 14:9, 28:14, 48:14,
64:25. 110:6. 113:23. 114:9. 114:19.
122:25. 142:19. 170:18. 175:11. 191:9.
191:19, 237:1, 257:21, 257:22, 285:24,
286:10, 286:16, 289:8, 299:19, 301:8,
305:18, 312:18, 313:6, 315:9, 321:22,
321:25, 322:20
 \textbf{pointed} \ {\tiny [5]} \ \textbf{-251:} 15, \ 261:18, \ 312:15,
314:14, 315:18
 pointing [1] - 312:21
 points [3] - 70:19, 113:19, 312:7
 police [1] - 20:7
 policy [2] - 172:5, 268:2
 political [1] - 22:7
 polynomial [29] - 94:16, 97:11, 104:18,
111:10, 152:19, 166:22, 176:25, 177:1,
178:8, 178:9, 178:14, 183:4, 183:7,
183:11, 196:6, 196:11, 196:12, 196:18,
196:21, 197:2, 197:6, 197:11, 197:17,
198:7, 198:18, 201:14, 201:15, 208:9
 polynomials [17] - 110:21, 120:21,
152:25, 177:13, 177:16, 177:19, 177:25,
195:25, 196:3, 196:8, 198:12, 201:1,
201:4, 201:11, 201:12, 201:19, 201:20
 poorly [1] - 43:9
 pop [1] - 218:8
 POP [1] - 175:11
 portfolio [13] - 66:19, 218:16, 219:10,
220:1, 225:12, 233:7, 233:16, 242:17,
271:1, 278:3, 278:10, 278:15, 278:19
 portfolios [1] - 270:22
 portion [5] - 77:6, 305:5, 309:13,
309:15, 321:12
 portions [2] - 233:16, 270:22
 position [6] - 46:15, 145:23, 215:6,
243:22, 244:13, 318:7
 positions [2] - 87:14, 314:11
 possible [12] - 8:8, 13:12, 77:5, 142:12,
147:11, 156:3, 159:18, 184:16, 184:20,
185:2, 192:25, 195:4
 possibly [1] - 64:25
 post [1] - 78:16
 postpone [3] - 314:22, 315:1, 320:24
 potential [5] - 233:21, 237:8, 252:16,
260:19, 264:13
 potentially [7] - 23:21, 202:2, 207:18,
224:14, 227:15, 227:23, 247:9
 Potter [2] - 34:17, 34:20
 pouring [1] - 102:5
 power [3] - 170:1, 170:3, 170:4
 practical [2] - 184:21, 188:10
 practice [6] - 17:15, 185:16, 267:13,
274:23, 283:10, 283:11
 practiced [1] - 96:23
```

```
precisely [2] - 191:13, 319:15
 predate [1] - 191:15
 preexisting [1] - 208:12
 prefer [2] - 10:21, 162:9
 preferred [2] - 197:17, 258:6
 prejudice [5] - 309:25, 310:16, 310:17,
314:9, 319:17
 prejudiced [1] - 319:7
 prejudicial [4] - 318:6, 318:25, 319:11,
319:12
 preliminary [19] - 6:17, 6:20, 6:23, 7:3,
8:3, 8:12, 8:19, 8:20, 8:24, 9:15, 9:21,
9:24, 67:8, 68:1, 70:3, 72:16, 92:18,
189:23, 189:25
 prepare [2] - 73:6, 173:18
 preparing [1] - 174:3
 preponderance [7] - 35:16, 35:17,
35:20, 36:6, 91:12, 91:19, 92:3
 preschool [1] - 211:16
 presence [1] - 175:11
 present [35] - 6:4, 6:5, 11:9, 13:2, 13:4,
49:24, 50:6, 63:25, 64:1, 68:7, 68:8,
73:9, 73:11, 107:20, 113:22, 133:11,
135:2, 135:3, 184:5, 184:24, 210:3,
210:4, 244:15, 244:17, 244:19, 302:7,
302:8, 307:24, 309:13, 311:9, 313:21,
316:12, 316:19
 presentation [1] - 209:20
 presented [5] - 13:5, 29:2, 50:3, 87:9,
 presenting [3] - 90:24, 133:9, 306:3
 presently [1] - 23:9
 preserve [1] - 309:17
 President [2] - 115:17, 275:16
 president [8] - 22:4, 112:12, 115:16,
117:11, 144:7, 218:1, 232:11, 275:14
 Presidents [1] - 115:17
 PRESIDING [1] - 6:3
 presumed [1] - 86:12
 presumption [1] - 86:12
 Pretrial [1] - 302:17
 pretty [12] - 21:17, 34:10, 64:22, 66:5,
66:16, 66:17, 96:7, 96:25, 172:8,
191:19, 198:11, 243:23
 prevent [3] - 24:1, 83:13, 98:17
 prevents [1] - 83:15
 preview [1] - 73:6
 previous [4] - 41:11, 105:7, 156:25,
157:1
 previously [3] - 69:2, 104:8, 143:4
 price [3] - 43:5, 162:3, 305:5
 Priddy [6] - 17:2, 39:14, 39:21, 39:25,
41:20, 51:6
 primarily [3] - 215:7, 238:11, 287:7
 principal [3] - 145:9, 145:24, 315:12
 principle [1] - 128:24
 principles [2] - 48:2, 84:3
 printed [1] - 85:12
 priority [1] - 194:20
 priority-encode [1] - 194:20
```

```
privacy [1] - 14:7
 private [9] - 14:3, 14:5, 19:3, 19:25,
140:11, 140:15, 142:20, 147:25, 148:1
 privileges [1] - 12:5
 probabilities [1] - 267:19
 probability [1] - 267:21
 probable [1] - 91:13
 problem [18] - 55:13, 63:8, 95:22.
127:16. 127:17. 143:3. 186:20. 186:23.
187:15, 229:10, 229:24, 246:14, 246:17,
247:12, 247:14, 317:22, 318:4, 320:19
 problematic [1] - 66:4
 problems [5] - 24:21, 95:6, 95:19,
98:17, 246:19
 procedure [3] - 73:1, 266:2, 303:4
 procedures [1] - 76:16
 proceed [3] - 135:18, 154:24, 243:5
 Proceedings [1] - 324:12
 proceedings [1] - 301:21
 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 324:16
 proceeds [5] - 154:9, 176:6, 185:10,
204:8, 289:14
 process [40] - 12:20, 12:25, 13:19,
14:6, 14:12, 14:14, 26:16, 57:8, 70:21,
76:10, 80:16, 82:3, 84:11, 84:12, 85:20,
85:21, 85:24, 86:2, 86:6, 104:21,
125:24, 126:1, 131:25, 165:20, 165:22,
165:23, 165:25, 166:10, 186:17, 188:17,
202:12, 209:1, 247:18, 272:12, 272:15,
272:21, 272:24, 273:13, 273:19, 274:19
 processes [1] - 166:10
 Processing [1] - 119:4
 processing [16] - 115:8, 119:14,
120:22, 124:8, 139:4, 152:17, 153:22,
157:2, 157:7, 159:21, 164:14, 164:23,
166:4, 249:3, 251:10, 261:2
 processor [47] - 33:14, 33:16, 33:22,
95:23, 95:24, 96:8, 96:10, 96:11, 96:15,
96:16, 96:20, 101:17, 101:20, 114:13,
116:12, 119:6, 119:22, 119:25, 120:4,
120:19, 120:24, 121:12, 121:14, 124:9,
125:3, 125:7, 126:3, 141:7, 151:15,
151:20, 159:9, 161:7, 165:16, 166:20,
175:24, 176:14, 190:11, 206:19, 207:10,
248:19, 253:7, 263:17, 310:22, 310:23,
315:17, 315:18
 Processor [2] - 119:3, 149:15
 processors [77] - 25:20, 94:12, 94:23,
97:22, 97:24, 98:7, 98:18, 98:19, 99:4,
101:10, 101:12, 101:22, 101:23, 103:10,
103:25, 108:3, 113:2, 114:24, 116:1,
116:7, 116:19, 118:7, 118:8, 118:14,
119:1, 119:8, 119:12, 125:20, 126:20,
127:9, 151:17, 151:18, 157:5, 158:11,
158:20, 159:1, 159:4, 159:15, 159:18,
159:19, 160:2, 160:5, 160:17, 160:24,
161:12, 161:14, 165:14, 165:19, 165:20,
165:24, 165:25, 166:3, 166:4, 204:25,
206:21, 245:14, 248:19, 249:1, 249:2,
249:12, 249:19, 255:14, 256:16, 261:7,
261:8, 262:13, 263:14, 263:23, 264:16,
```

```
264:17, 290:16, 290:20, 291:6, 297:12,
                                               proof [7] - 91:3, 91:6, 91:7, 91:21,
299:23
                                             91:23, 92:6
 procurement [1] - 142:15
                                              proper [2] - 313:10, 322:3
 produce [2] - 178:13, 180:5
                                               properly [2] - 160:9, 317:13
 produced [1] - 174:8
                                               property [8] - 37:25, 205:19, 218:3,
 produces [1] - 91:25
                                             219:2, 219:5, 243:17, 244:14, 268:6
 product [32] - 32:16, 32:24, 48:19,
                                              Proposal [1] - 250:21
56:10, 87:21, 87:22, 88:3, 88:4, 90:6,
                                               proposal [3] - 166:15, 228:10, 230:19
106:7, 109:15, 111:4, 116:9, 124:2,
                                              proposals [5] - 157:20, 228:3, 230:18,
186:21, 192:15, 192:19, 192:20, 192:23,
                                             233:15, 270:21
215:20, 221:9, 221:13, 222:14, 223:2,
                                              propose [3] - 64:6, 67:7, 302:19
262:18, 268:4, 268:11, 268:15, 268:16,
                                              Proposed [1] - 81:1
268:18, 291:11
                                               proposed [10] - 8:18, 128:1, 236:14,
 production [4] - 194:10, 198:21, 200:4,
                                             274:22, 306:23, 313:16, 315:15, 316:10,
214:25
                                             316:25, 317:1
 products [56] - 48:6, 48:15, 52:19,
                                               proposes [1] - 9:20
52:20, 53:14, 53:15, 53:19, 54:13,
                                               proposing [2] - 128:16, 186:21
55:11, 87:24, 90:10, 100:7, 100:23,
                                               proprietary [1] - 166:23
103:13, 107:17, 108:25, 109:5, 109:9,
                                               prosecuting [1] - 202:17
109:14, 110:9, 110:22, 114:14, 114:18,
                                              prosecution [3] - 84:12, 86:4, 86:5
114:23, 118:10, 118:21, 129:6, 133:15,
                                              prospective [6] - 6:4, 25:11, 63:25,
156:5, 156:7, 156:14, 164:2, 164:3,
                                             68:7, 70:11, 72:10
164:4, 164:11, 204:14, 205:22, 215:5,
                                              PROSPECTIVE [110] - 15:4, 15:11,
241:8, 241:12, 253:7, 253:8, 256:22,
                                             15:19, 16:2, 16:7, 16:12, 16:18, 17:2,
260:14, 264:19, 268:11, 274:1, 274:4,
                                             17:8, 17:13, 17:20, 18:6, 18:17, 18:24,
274:22, 274:23, 279:19, 292:14, 293:12,
                                             19:8, 19:15, 19:23, 20:5, 20:13, 20:23,
304:4, 304:8
                                             21:7, 21:19, 22:3, 22:13, 22:22, 23:7,
 professor [1] - 103:4
                                             24:7, 24:14, 24:18, 24:24, 26:5, 31:13,
 professors [1] - 137:12
                                             31:15, 31:19, 31:23, 32:2, 32:4, 32:11,
 profiles [1] - 244:7
                                             33:8, 33:10, 33:13, 33:17, 34:3, 34:6,
 profit [10] - 106:5, 106:7, 106:9, 240:7,
                                             36:21, 37:16, 39:16, 39:23, 40:4, 40:7,
240:10, 240:14, 289:22, 289:25, 298:1,
                                             40:12, 40:18, 40:21, 41:15, 41:25, 42:2,
                                             42:16, 42:18, 42:23, 43:2, 43:7, 43:8,
 Profit [1] - 240:2
                                             43:11, 43:14, 44:13, 46:12, 46:19,
 profits [4] - 106:6, 258:17, 285:1,
                                             46:24, 50:25, 51:3, 51:7, 51:14, 51:17,
289:15
                                             51:21, 51:25, 52:4, 52:7, 52:9, 52:15,
 program [9] - 20:15, 176:5, 224:14,
                                             52:18, 52:21, 54:2, 54:5, 54:9, 54:11,
224:16, 224:17, 227:10, 246:3, 257:13,
                                             54:18, 54:23, 55:9, 56:9, 56:13, 56:17,
272:20
                                             57:3, 57:5, 57:12, 58:10, 58:13, 58:17,
 programmable [3] - 177:25, 201:18,
                                             60:4, 60:7, 60:11, 60:15, 60:18, 60:24,
201:21
                                             61:5, 61:6, 61:19, 62:1, 62:11, 62:15,
 programs [1] - 53:20
                                             62:23
 progress [2] - 191:21, 273:5
                                              Prospective [1] - 11:9
 project [53] - 96:7, 96:17, 96:18, 99:13,
                                              protection [8] - 84:5, 86:9, 86:22, 87:2,
99:14, 101:15, 136:20, 146:9, 146:14,
                                             128:17, 128:20, 128:24, 128:25
146:19, 147:2, 147:3, 147:6, 147:21,
                                              protocol [17] - 121:21, 126:25, 127:15.
148:15, 148:23, 149:5, 149:8, 150:6,
                                             132:19, 164:14, 186:25, 187:2, 187:3,
150:12, 150:21, 151:7, 151:13, 151:24,
                                             195:17, 195:21, 195:22, 196:22, 197:12,
151:25, 155:6, 155:11, 156:3, 156:9,
                                             197:21, 197:24, 214:1, 245:14
170:25, 171:2, 172:4, 172:14, 172:22,
                                              protocols [18] - 119:25, 120:7, 120:10,
172:24, 185:24, 185:25, 186:2, 186:15,
                                             120:15, 127:19, 132:21, 187:5, 187:17,
188:15, 189:4, 191:6, 191:8, 191:16,
                                             187:22, 187:25, 195:10, 196:4, 196:9,
192:18, 193:5, 204:24, 222:1, 222:20,
                                             197:13, 197:18, 209:1, 209:3, 213:22
262:18, 298:13
                                               prototype [1] - 223:11
 Projects [1] - 140:4
                                               prototypes [1] - 218:3
 projects [10] - 136:18, 138:19, 138:21,
                                               proud [3] - 143:1, 154:11, 154:13
139:11, 142:8, 142:25, 146:16, 221:24,
                                               prove [5] - 35:16, 36:7, 91:23, 122:18,
276:11, 286:17
                                             304:10
 promise [3] - 237:8, 289:14, 297:17
                                              proven [4] - 35:20, 75:12, 87:10, 92:1
 promotions [1] - 145:14
                                              provide [9] - 90:2, 113:18, 134:20,
 promptly [1] - 291:16
                                             201:11, 274:2, 275:1, 302:19, 307:24,
```

```
provided [7] - 90:20, 134:19, 173:20,
311:4, 321:14, 321:15, 321:16
 providing [3] - 125:1, 132:16, 194:11
 proving [4] - 91:10, 91:18, 102:1,
142:12
 provision [1] - 293:19
 provisional [9] - 99:16, 193:16, 193:25,
194:4, 194:6, 194:8, 195:24, 201:25,
 pry [1] - 13:25
 PS-7900 [1] - 118:13
 pseudo [1] - 223:16
 psychologist [1] - 20:19
 psychology [1] - 20:9
 PTO [6] - 83:7, 83:9, 85:19, 86:11,
86:19, 202:13
 PTX [38] - 4:23, 4:24, 4:25, 5:1, 5:2, 5:3,
5:4, 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 5:8, 5:9, 5:10, 5:11,
5:12, 5:13, 287:13, 287:16, 287:18,
287:20, 288:9, 288:10, 288:14, 288:24,
292:22, 292:25, 293:1, 293:3, 293:4,
293:6, 296:11, 300:5, 300:11
 public [11] - 14:2, 22:8, 84:4, 86:10,
123:19, 160:15, 160:19, 161:4, 229:17,
250:5, 250:6
 publication [1] - 85:12
 publicly [4] - 85:11, 137:25, 242:7,
 published [2] - 117:10, 117:23
 pull [3] - 260:13, 260:14, 260:17
 punish [2] - 67:10, 88:15
 punishment [1] - 88:16
 purchase [14] - 42:3, 43:5, 137:17,
167:2, 217:10, 270:24, 278:9, 278:14,
278:19, 280:3, 287:6, 290:5, 290:7,
 Purchase [2] - 239:7, 239:11
 purchased [11] - 33:20, 43:3, 43:4,
50:17, 109:18, 137:21, 214:6, 214:8,
217:9, 291:20
 purchases [1] - 287:2
 purchasing [2] - 217:1, 286:13
 purported [3] - 247:17, 279:2, 279:4
 purpose [6] - 13:20, 13:24, 13:25, 76:2,
76:3, 323:3
 purposes [4] - 90:1, 90:12, 230:22,
231:16
 pursue [1] - 248:17
 push [4] - 36:4, 260:13, 260:16
 put [25] - 14:18, 36:25, 99:12, 100:11,
120:19, 124:5, 141:7, 141:21, 158:14,
185:20, 189:20, 223:6, 228:9, 228:13,
228:17, 243:21, 244:17, 245:20, 246:10,
250:23, 260:6, 293:21, 297:18, 309:12,
315:23
 putting [1] - 106:9
```

311:18

Q

QPI [5] - 128:9, 131:18, 132:2, 133:16, 268:18

Qualcomm [1] - 231:7 qualification [1] - 268:23 quality [4] - 246:5, 246:12, 252:5, 252:13

quantum [1] - 255:2 quarter [1] - 223:3

questioning [7] - 10:15, 10:19, 13:24,

13:25, 29:7, 67:8, 202:22

questionnaire [1] - 36:14 questions [53] - 8:15, 10:17, 11:1, 12:21, 12:22, 13:14, 13:15, 13:16, 13:17, 14:7, 14:17, 14:20, 14:24, 15:1, 23:17, 29:9, 30:22, 35:7, 35:12, 37:6, 48:1, 55:22, 59:3, 59:4, 59:16, 74:25, 81:10, 81:23, 81:24, 82:1, 82:4, 82:5, 82:15, 82:23, 82:24, 82:25, 117:17, 153:13, 165:14, 166:12, 167:1, 167:3, 168:14, 180:13, 202:20, 202:21, 260:6, 262:22, 263:1, 264:24, 266:3, 266:5, 273:23

quickly [3] - 29:20, 96:7, 206:10 QuickPath [2] - 128:9, 133:16 quite [7] - 30:9, 66:12, 84:24, 107:5, 115:6, 258:2, 259:3

quote [2] - 150:1, 197:11 quoted [1] - 194:8

R

R-A-S [1] - 104:20 radar [1] - 139:3 radars [1] - 137:9 radio [3] - 53:21, 59:7, 284:4 raise [14] - 36:10, 37:4, 37:8, 44:6,

47:19, 57:24, 59:23, 220:18, 302:11, 309:22, 315:9, 316:27, 316:23, 324:10

raised [4] - 45:19, 60:21, 309:24, 323:11

raises [1] - 216:5

raising [2] - 32:21, 33:2 RAMP [2] - 223:22, 223:23 ramp.com [1] - 223:22

ran [5] - 152:4, 163:24, 213:16, 213:17, 222:21

Randee [1] - 19:8 Randy [1] - 19:10 rank [1] - 264:23 ranked [1] - 242:21

ranking [4] - 264:21, 264:22, 265:11,

265:14

ranks [1] - 145:14

RAS [6] - 104:20, 303:23, 304:2, 305:1,

305:12, 305:19

rate [7] - 203:15, 203:17, 321:18, 321:24, 322:4, 322:5, 322:21

rather [2] - 94:4, 201:21 rating [1] - 252:12

rationale [1] - 279:9 Ray [1] - 141:19

Raytheon [11] - 50:20, 50:21, 137:6, 137:7, 137:8, 137:16, 137:17, 137:19, 137:21, 221:18, 242:15

re [2] - 165:6, 168:16 re-call [1] - 168:16

re-read [1] - 165:6

 $\boldsymbol{reach}~{\scriptscriptstyle [4]}~-~39{:}4,~73{:}13,~74{:}5,~292{:}16$

 $\pmb{\text{reached}}\ [4]\ \textbf{-}\ 74\text{:}12,\ 293\text{:}7,\ 293\text{:}9,$

295:18

reaching [1] - 323:6

reaction [2] - 65:22, 253:24

read [28] - 6:22, 22:1, 27:21, 53:22, 55:18, 60:15, 60:25, 71:3, 77:7, 77:9, 79:8, 101:19, 165:6, 165:17, 179:8, 179:18, 180:12, 180:15, 205:3, 232:14, 248:19, 255:7, 259:23, 264:4, 264:6, 279:15, 280:8, 294:1

reading [5] - 69:14, 69:15, 122:5, 124:23, 205:3

reads [3] - 177:10, 178:7, 183:12 **ready** [3] - 22:19, 70:8, 92:12

Reagan [1] - 115:17

real [6] - 98:10, 104:21, 112:9, 118:10, 118:11, 317:22

really [33] - 12:4, 28:24, 30:6, 39:23, 39:24, 47:8, 47:16, 58:6, 61:20, 107:14, 107:21, 108:18, 109:1, 116:6, 119:21, 122:21, 127:11, 128:4, 129:4, 156:19, 166:20, 221:1, 227:13, 234:3, 246:5, 247:4, 247:11, 248:14, 302:4, 305:3, 307:25, 314:9

reapplied [1] - 179:21

reason [31] - 30:21, 54:6, 61:14, 61:16, 64:23, 65:17, 66:19, 70:3, 77:10, 79:9, 82:11, 106:20, 107:2, 115:9, 118:23, 132:9, 132:11, 133:5, 160:13, 189:7, 237:22, 254:4, 254:21, 254:25, 265:19, 268:12, 277:18, 293:15, 309:9, 312:11

reasonable [6] - 75:12, 88:19, 92:4, 280:10, 317:13, 319:5

reasoning [2] - 253:18, 253:21 reasons [8] - 38:12, 75:24, 82:19, 114:20, 115:4, 226:19, 248:9, 279:8 reassemble [1] - 187:21

rebuttal [3] - 73:11, 305:22, 306:5 **receipt** [1] - 135:4

receive [8] - 74:6, 136:13, 144:1, 144:3, 154:9, 154:10, 248:1, 258:13

Received [1] - 269:17

received [22] - 57:1, 57:15, 60:2, 74:11, 75:5, 75:11, 95:13, 133:25, 143:13, 158:7, 179:20, 212:8, 212:10, 212:14, 212:15, 235:10, 235:12, 235:20, 269:13, 275:21, 283:7, 283:8

receives [1] - 122:8

receiving [3] - 107:23, 183:13, 254:22

recent [4] - 139:2, 143:21, 214:21, 312:13

recently [2] - 238:16, 312:19

recess [4] - 11:6, 63:12, 76:23, 77:20 Recess [6] - 11:8, 63:24, 68:6, 135:1,

210:2, 302:6

recesses [1] - 78:24

 $\textbf{recognition} \ [5] \textbf{ - 217:} 19, \ 221:} 8, \ 223:} 9,$

223:14, 228:8

recognize [6] - 148:21, 163:11, 193:13,

193:14, 199:4, 223:13

recognized [2] - 115:14, 145:20 recollection [5] - 189:11, 189:14,

189:18, 206:1, 294:3

recommend [1] - 54:19

recommendation [1] - 145:19

reconnect [1] - 215:23

reconstructed [1] - 213:24

RECORD [1] - 324:16

record [5] - 86:6, 154:21, 171:15,

179:17, 304:22

records [1] - 275:11

recover [1] - 84:7

recovered [1] - 179:20

recovery [1] - 242:12

rectangle [2] - 175:13, 175:15

recurring [2] - 234:2, 234:8

recusal [1] - 65:20

red [4] - 36:5, 163:1, 163:2, 258:21

redactions [2] - 295:2 redesigned [1] - 222:13

redirect [2] - 165:8, 262:9

REDIRECT [2] - 165:11, 262:11

redo [1] - 49:19

reduced [1] - 177:20

 $\pmb{ redundancy}\ [6]\ -\ 96:23,\ 97:1,\ 97:2,$

117:6, 117:9, 177:11

Redundancy [1] - 149:15

refer [8] - 62:22, 79:25, 80:4, 97:4,

145:21, 183:16, 201:19

reference [27] - 89:16, 126:6, 175:13, 175:21, 176:24, 181:19, 182:3, 182:14, 188:25, 189:4, 190:10, 193:24, 194:24, 195:3, 195:11, 196:5, 196:6, 196:10, 196:12, 196:18, 197:20, 207:22, 308:14,

309:6, 309:23, 311:17, 314:20 referenced [3] - 87:18, 287:19, 299:1 references [11] - 85:16, 85:17, 183:2, 196:3, 278:18, 307:2, 308:11, 309:1,

309:3, 315:21, 315:23

referencing [2] - 178:5, 199:15 referred [8] - 83:6, 149:14, 173:5,

179:5, 188:4, 190:17, 197:9, 272:12 referring [8] - 62:14, 173:8, 180:16,

180:18, 185:10, 187:10, 202:8, 285:5 **refers** [3] - 182:25, 190:21, 197:1

refinery [1] - 19:18

reflect [1] - 14:11 reflection [1] - 70:20 reflects [1] - 285:13

Reform [1] - 44:18 reframe [1] - 82:20 regard [4] - 65:6, 65:8, 200:20 regarded [1] - 104:7 regarding [2] - 78:16, 297:15 regardless [1] - 70:22 Regina [1] - 17:14 region [1] - 20:25 Regional [1] - 20:17 register [12] - 110:18, 110:20, 111:4, 111:6, 111:8, 111:11, 170:7, 176:8, 207:4, 207:6, 207:9, 207:10 registered [2] - 18:14, 19:18 regression [1] - 304:5 regular [3] - 211:21, 213:18, 234:2 regularly [1] - 60:16 rehab [1] - 22:15 reiterate [1] - 70:19 rejected [5] - 299:16, 299:20, 299:21, 311:14, 322:20 relate [5] - 151:13, 152:14, 200:5, 232:23, 268:14 related [33] - 9:3, 25:20, 31:12, 31:14, 79:5, 81:23, 102:6, 109:15, 141:2, 151:3, 151:4, 158:20, 198:9, 200:14, 200:15, 202:5, 224:7, 224:8, 231:22, 233:24, 236:10, 238:3, 241:3, 254:24, 255:13, 286:8, 287:22, 288:22, 290:7, 290:11, 290:24, 297:3, 320:8 Related [1] - 193:25 relates [9] - 6:15, 66:21, 85:6, 98:1, 236:21, 315:13, 317:24, 321:8, 322:8 relating [1] - 81:8 relations [1] - 22:8 **relationship** [11] - 6:19, 26:15, 27:17, 27:24, 28:21, 51:1, 51:6, 51:15, 52:17, 110:2, 297:22 relative [2] - 26:2, 202:22 released [1] - 221:9 relevance [1] - 304:11 relevant [11] - 40:10, 89:11, 156:23, 157:2, 158:8, 202:2, 206:19, 207:19, 304:16, 305:20, 313:4 reliable [1] - 213:22 relied [5] - 105:10, 262:23, 318:6, 319:13, 321:17 relies [1] - 309:6 religious [1] - 19:21 reload [1] - 183:20 rely [3] - 103:11, 109:6, 305:22 relying [2] - 110:10, 320:7 remain [1] - 59:20 remainder [2] - 72:4, 178:9 remaining [1] - 72:10 remarkable [2] - 274:15, 279:20 remarks [1] - 113:20 remember [36] - 51:5, 54:25, 60:4, 60:7, 60:8, 60:9, 60:12, 60:19, 61:2, 61:7, 104:15, 106:16, 110:7, 134:16,

162:23, 171:8, 172:2, 172:10, 173:3,

173:11, 187:17, 189:2, 190:3, 190:5, 190:23, 191:13, 197:16, 205:10, 205:25, 206:2, 258:23, 264:24, 275:5, 275:10 remembers [4] - 273:20, 273:21, 274:11, 274:12 remind [1] - 301:19 reminded [1] - 266:1 remove [2] - 24:9, 84:4 render [6] - 29:1, 114:18, 274:9, 307:3, 309:19, 314:14 rendered [1] - 308:23 renders [1] - 6:25 repeat [3] - 41:6, 152:22, 260:2 repeated [1] - 157:7 repeatedly [2] - 157:4, 157:6 reply [1] - 306:3 report [21] - 107:18, 186:6, 304:6, 307:12, 307:16, 308:17, 308:20, 309:14, 310:6, 310:8, 311:5, 312:14, 312:20, 312:25, 313:2, 313:9, 316:6, 317:22, 318:2, 319:4 reported [2] - 272:19, 272:22 reporter [1] - 221:15 **REPORTER** [1] - 63:20 REPORTER'S [2] - 6:1, 324:13 reporters [8] - 11:24, 63:16, 63:19, 77:2, 77:8, 210:21, 218:12, 303:17 reports [7] - 307:5, 307:24, 308:12, 309:16, 311:24, 313:21, 316:11 represent [8] - 27:8, 68:21, 237:10, 263:13, 286:20, 294:23, 298:1, 304:12 representative [1] - 27:12 representatives [5] - 26:12, 27:17, 93:13. 93:14. 267:16 represented [2] - 202:23, 203:1 representing [1] - 202:25 reproduced [1] - 110:8 reprovide [1] - 183:21 request [7] - 66:21, 143:2, 157:20, 157:24, 228:3, 228:10, 315:15 Request [1] - 250:20 requested [2] - 64:3, 293:10 requests [2] - 166:15, 230:18 require [4] - 9:17, 72:7, 145:17, 279:19 required [5] - 90:23, 129:7, 155:15, 160:14, 319:16 requirement [1] - 197:23 requirements [4] - 87:3, 87:25, 120:9, 187:18 requires [4] - 107:23, 129:17, 145:19, 184:11 research [11] - 79:4, 139:18, 171:2, 217:15, 220:9, 222:6, 225:11, 232:17, 232:20, 286:16 Research [4] - 140:3, 140:8, 140:9, 140:10 reservations [1] - 29:5 residual [1] - 167:22 residue [2] - 111:4, 111:6

46:2, 79:14, 167:18, 253:22, 316:20 resolved [3] - 6:11, 160:9, 253:16 resources [1] - 298:1 respect [31] - 6:9, 9:7, 27:23, 65:18, 77:22, 89:25, 102:25, 141:12, 166:4, 168:6, 219:10, 227:24, 268:21, 274:4, 275:7, 277:16, 291:14, 308:17, 308:22, 309:18, 309:23, 309:24, 310:3, 310:16, 316:5, 317:3, 317:7, 320:6, 321:4, 321:10, 322:17 respectfully [2] - 103:22, 322:22 respects [1] - 268:5 respond [6] - 14:2, 15:1, 255:16, 255:22, 256:12, 304:20 responded [1] - 255:22 responding [2] - 14:24, 204:6 response [6] - 255:24, 256:1, 256:10, 305:16, 315:24, 316:3 responses [1] - 23:16 responsibilities [5] - 12:5, 139:7, 139:10, 214:18, 215:3 responsibility [3] - 105:5, 126:4, 138:20 responsible [2] - 138:19, 214:20 rest [8] - 25:10, 71:6, 139:13, 154:15, 166:1, 176:4, 219:20, 297:18 restarts [1] - 191:14 restate [1] - 159:24 restrictive [1] - 312:1 result [14] - 67:7, 151:25, 178:10, 178:13, 179:22, 180:6, 204:9, 209:13, 209:17, 220:25, 227:2, 312:3, 312:13 resulted [2] - 193:17, 277:13 results [2] - 179:23, 179:25 retained [1] - 167:23 retired [18] - 16:8, 17:22, 18:11, 19:1, 19:2, 20:8, 20:15, 21:9, 21:14, 23:8, 51:18, 144:14, 145:7, 145:23, 145:24, 170:16, 170:18 retirement [2] - 31:20, 155:23 return [6] - 63:17, 63:18, 134:14, 209:25, 301:13, 302:1 Reuters [1] - 223:25 revenue [15] - 105:8, 106:22, 154:6, 162:4, 162:6, 233:21, 234:2, 234:6, 234:8, 321:14, 321:15, 321:16, 323:6, revenues [3] - 221:21, 236:17, 240:9 review [9] - 82:15, 84:14, 158:1, 158:3, 158:5, 158:17, 174:19, 255:19, 306:19 reviewed [11] - 57:17, 157:24, 174:18, 236:2, 265:6, 265:7, 278:22, 279:11, 280:5, 280:7, 280:8 reviewing [1] - 235:13 reviews [1] - 83:10 revisions [1] - 189:3 rewrite [1] - 249:5 RFP [7] - 230:12, 232:5, 233:1, 233:10, 236:6, 251:3, 264:23 RFPs [2] - 231:6, 250:17

resolve [10] - 6:18, 7:5, 8:7, 9:10, 9:18,

rural [1] - 136:6

Ryan [1] - 19:24

Rhode [1] - 136:25 Richard [1] - 16:2 rider [1] - 30:3 right-hand [3] - 80:14, 80:20, 117:20 rights [4] - 48:13, 89:22, 167:23, 301:1 ring [1] - 123:25 ripe [1] - 305:10 risk [2] - 237:20, 275:9 risky [2] - 227:5, 258:15 Rita [1] - 20:6 RMR [1] - 324:19 RMR-CRR [1] - 324:19 Roark [13] - 17:8, 31:10, 31:12, 31:17, 33:7, 36:20, 37:10, 39:20, 41:13, 52:14, 54:1, 57:25, 59:13 Robert [4] - 27:12, 28:11, 34:22, 35:1 **Robinson** [5] - 20:14, 33:12, 33:19, 41:18, 55:8 Rogers [2] - 18:18 role [11] - 12:11, 49:12, 49:13, 49:15, 49:16, 174:14, 217:12, 217:23, 217:24, 226:7 roles [2] - 217:25, 218:1 roll [2] - 128:5 rolled [1] - 291:22 rolling [25] - 94:24, 98:24, 99:2, 104:16, 104:23, 113:3, 115:1, 117:2, 126:24, 127:10, 128:1, 128:3, 128:8, 129:16, 129:24, 130:5, 130:9, 130:12, 130:17, 131:1, 131:19, 132:18, 133:18, 268:19 rolls [1] - 131:18 $\textbf{room} \ \textbf{[6] - 78:22, 79:2, 115:7, 134:21,}$ 166:2, 301:21 Rosa [1] - 11:23 Router [2] - 147:3, 148:12 router [22] - 95:17, 95:20, 96:3, 96:18, 101:15, 141:6, 142:11, 142:13, 142:15, 144:25, 146:21, 147:12, 147:17, 147:20, 148:24, 173:6, 185:24, 188:15, 190:1 routers [3] - 141:2, 141:3, 147:15 routing [1] - 157:1 row [1] - 51:24 **Roy** [1] - 21:8 royalty [6] - 88:18, 88:19, 233:21, 317:13, 319:5, 319:9 RPR [1] - 324:20 **RPR-CRR** [1] - 324:20 rude [1] - 78:3 rule [8] - 75:16, 93:3, 184:23, 206:12, 307:10, 314:21, 315:3, 320:17 ruled [2] - 80:19, 323:15 rules [5] - 76:15, 99:18, 120:11, 120:13, 120:16 ruling [1] - 314:22 **rulings** [1] - 75:18 run [7] - 59:4, 79:8, 164:2, 173:22,

220:17, 226:22, 272:17

176:7, 272:21

runs [1] - 131:18

running [6] - 129:18, 131:3, 131:4,

S safe [2] - 99:6, 284:2 sake [1] - 99:22 salaried [1] - 18:10 salary [2] - 15:7, 15:13 sale [8] - 83:16, 168:5, 230:5, 233:8, 233:15, 239:12, 270:21, 278:3 Sale [1] - 288:15 **salesman** [1] - 54:19 Sanjeev [1] - 11:21 Santa [1] - 283:9 **sat** [1] - 96:6 **satellite** [1] - 171:2 satisfied [1] - 92:6 satisfying [1] - 197:23 Saturday [3] - 13:12, 23:22, 73:17 sauce [1] - 102:9 save [1] - 301:22 saw [9] - 48:8, 72:25, 163:13, 174:23, 246:14, 278:16, 284:17, 287:9, 316:25 **scale** [2] - 265:1, 265:2 scheduling [1] - 139:4 school [14] - 18:20, 19:13, 21:24, 58:4, 58:5, 136:9, 136:16, 169:12, 212:3, 212:11, 212:12, 212:14, 283:6, 284:9 School [1] - 29:24 schoolteacher [3] - 17:5, 21:14, 21:21 Science [1] - 140:10 science [11] - 22:7, 58:6, 103:4, 139:25, 140:7, 169:15, 169:16, 169:17, 211:15, 212:9, 212:16 sciences [1] - 251:9 scientifically [1] - 145:16 scientist [4] - 145:9, 186:4, 213:21, 265.9 scientists [4] - 115:23, 139:13, 147:16, scope [4] - 100:19, 182:7, 229:2, 264:10 Scott [1] - 22:14 scrapbook [1] - 20:21 screen [6] - 14:23, 100:11, 117:7, 118:1, 123:4, 163:11 screens [2] - 14:17, 163:5 se [1] - 170:20 seamlessly [1] - 284:1 search [4] - 223:12, 223:17, 268:24 searches [2] - 268:3, 268:17 seated [6] - 26:25, 27:9, 27:10, 27:13, 68:23, 238:14 $\textbf{second}~{\tiny [28]}\textbf{-}62:11,~70:22,~74:2,~80:2,$ 108:11, 110:15, 114:9, 124:25, 131:4, 132:10, 132:12, 132:13, 132:14, 177:9, 179:10, 180:12, 188:24, 190:21, 220:12, 220:14, 229:5, 242:24, 259:3, 271:4,

292:4. 298:20. 303:21 secondly [1] - 139:12 secret [4] - 102:6, 102:9, 103:12, 291:5 **secretary** [1] - 23:11 section [3] - 177:6, 240:11, 306:24 Section [2] - 294:19, 295:8 secure [3] - 14:8, 78:10, 220:9 security [3] - 11:25, 168:13, 251:8 see [115] - 8:12, 28:22, 29:6, 30:22, 31:4, 32:18, 36:15, 48:7, 64:25, 78:1, 79:10, 80:7, 80:10, 80:14, 80:19, 86:3, 88:25, 89:3, 89:13, 100:5, 100:13, 100:14, 101:23, 103:5, 103:20, 105:11, 111:3, 111:5, 121:9, 122:19, 127:7, 127:15, 129:16, 148:6, 149:12, 149:14, 149:25, 162:22, 175:15, 178:5, 178:11, 179:13, 181:14, 181:17, 182:13, 185:17, 188:18, 189:6, 189:8, 190:8, 194:12, 194:16, 194:24, 195:24, 202:11, 207:22, 215:4, 218:4, 220:21, 226:22, 234:23, 234:25, 235:1, 235:17, 239:18, 239:19, 254:20, 255:24, 256:15, 257:2, 258:23, 259:4, 259:9, 259:14, 259:20, 260:18, 269:21, 270:9, 270:15, 270:16, 270:18, 270:19, 270:23, 271:1, 271:2, 271:6, 271:18, 271:24, 278:1, 278:4, 278:10, 278:11, 278:15, 278:20, 278:21, 278:23, 287:14, 288:13, 288:21, 288:23, 288:24, 292:22, 292:24, 294:20, 296:5, 300:1, 302:5, 306:25, 309:20, 314:23, 320:20, 320:25, 324:7 seeing [2] - 118:1, 162:23 seek [1] - 277:15 seeking [6] - 8:21, 9:23, 10:1, 10:2, 191:2, 270:21 seem [6] - 8:23, 163:23, 167:24, 168:1, 237:12. 317:1 segregate [1] - 317:23 select [4] - 12:16, 13:21, 71:2, 125:10 selectable [1] - 178:1 selected [17] - 12:17, 12:19, 12:23, 12:25, 13:7, 14:10, 14:11, 14:15, 28:25, 70:17, 71:4, 71:25, 72:5, 72:8, 163:12, 183:13 selecting [2] - 10:25, 13:20 **selection** [9] - 7:16, 12:20, 63:14, 70:15, 72:7, 76:11, 87:19, 158:3, 158:5 selects [4] - 122:9, 122:10, 181:15, 181:24 self [2] - 15:21, 16:4 self-employed [2] - 15:21, 16:4 sell [18] - 87:23, 99:4, 102:16, 106:2, 157:4, 216:11, 217:2, 217:11, 222:23, 225:4, 227:22, 233:4, 235:3, 238:1, 238:5, 238:6, 238:8, 258:6 selling [14] - 83:14, 87:23, 94:22, 100:7, 105:16, 106:1, 107:1, 162:24, 224:14, 234:2, 234:4, 240:22, 292:14, 293:12 sells [2] - 100:2, 133:15 semi [1] - 17:22

```
semi-retired [1] - 17:22
 Semiconductor [4] - 292:4, 292:5,
293.2 293.5
 semiconductor [1] - 214:24
 send [9] - 78:19, 98:20, 120:25, 121:5,
132:3, 202:20, 202:21, 228:3, 230:17
 sending [3] - 98:8, 253:23, 254:7
 sends [1] - 95:18
 senior [4] - 139:14, 213:21, 232:10,
258:18
 Senior [1] - 23:2
 sense [9] - 108:7, 111:25, 112:20,
145:15, 172:15, 200:15, 201:8, 201:17,
 Sensors [12] - 147:8, 147:24, 152:4,
155:6, 156:3, 159:10, 159:12, 159:13,
173:6, 188:2, 192:15
 sent [28] - 98:8, 116:16, 119:2, 126:14,
141:19, 157:20, 166:13, 166:14, 217:17,
228:20, 228:22, 230:19, 231:6, 232:6,
232:8, 232:10, 235:21, 236:6, 250:18,
250:22, 252:15, 254:11, 255:18, 269:24,
274:15, 274:16, 278:17
 sentence [11] - 8:24, 9:22, 9:24, 165:6,
178:7, 179:12, 181:12, 181:21, 181:23,
279:10, 279:13
 separate [14] - 97:10, 108:21, 108:24,
110:17, 111:9, 122:4, 122:14, 123:1,
152:18, 166:21, 248:2, 248:23, 285:4
 September [4] - 99:15, 99:20, 99:23,
 sequence [2] - 145:13, 147:18
 sequencer [6] - 175:21, 175:23, 176:2,
176:7, 176:9, 207:2
 serial [1] - 179:2
 serially [1] - 299:20
 series [4] - 37:6, 87:18, 204:17, 204:19
 serious [4] - 92:10, 256:24, 257:1,
 serve [2] - 23:19, 89:25
 server [22] - 94:22, 96:13, 97:22, 97:23,
101:10, 101:22, 101:23, 103:25, 104:21,
113:2, 127:3, 127:7, 133:15, 158:20,
165:25, 166:4, 255:14, 264:17, 290:16,
290:19, 297:12, 299:23
 servers [6] - 98:5, 98:6, 98:7, 98:19,
130:15, 255:4
 service [12] - 12:3, 12:4, 12:7, 12:8,
12:14, 16:21, 17:10, 45:25, 70:23,
113:16, 221:5
 services [2] - 226:1, 286:12
 Services [1] - 20:15
 set [17] - 89:11, 131:17, 131:23, 132:5,
176:7, 185:11, 201:13, 201:23, 205:8,
221:3, 222:13, 227:13, 239:11, 248:9,
304:3, 304:15, 323:17
 setting [3] - 224:13, 227:9, 256:5
 settled [2] - 105:5, 134:5
 settlements [1] - 261:16
 seven [1] - 138:5
```

```
seventh [1] - 29:25
 several [9] - 51:18, 57:7, 73:19, 139:4,
172:4, 172:25, 174:1, 219:12, 300:4
 Sewell [6] - 232:10, 269:14, 269:17,
270:11, 275:21, 278:8
 SEWELL [1] - 232:10
 Seydewitz [6] - 234:13, 234:19, 239:5,
239:14, 239:25, 263:25
 SFA [1] - 23:2
 shaking [1] - 32:19
 share [14] - 44:4, 44:8, 110:17, 231:16,
236:16, 240:3, 240:10, 240:14, 285:1,
287:25, 288:1, 289:14, 289:22, 289:25
 shared [4] - 111:7, 111:8, 298:4, 298:7
 shares [1] - 110:20
 sharing [1] - 240:8
 Sharma [9] - 28:16, 116:25, 127:25,
128:13, 128:15, 129:9, 130:1, 131:2,
299:11
 Sharma's [1] - 130:4
 Sharp [2] - 22:23
 sharp [5] - 32:18, 40:11, 40:15, 41:19,
54.15
 Shawn [1] - 53:6
 sheet [4] - 82:8, 82:10, 82:14, 228:24
 sheets [2] - 81:8, 168:13
 sheriff [1] - 19:3
 Sheriff's [1] - 19:2
 shift [3] - 178:22, 178:25, 194:21
 shop [1] - 55:10
 shortage [1] - 190:22
 shorthand [1] - 196:7
 shot [1] - 143:4
 show [27] - 31:4, 35:6, 35:8, 36:15,
59:7, 71:5, 84:15, 91:13, 98:14, 100:23,
104:15, 107:12, 108:8, 110:25, 114:8,
122:24, 123:4, 130:8, 167:8, 176:19,
183:1, 200:22, 241:19, 249:18, 251:5,
290:1, 316:11
 showed [1] - 65:13
 showing [7] - 102:19, 102:20, 117:7,
176:10, 176:17, 207:16, 249:23
 shown [9] - 178:23, 179:1, 185:4,
185:5, 185:6, 206:24, 208:19, 208:23,
249:17
 shows [8] - 30:3, 53:21, 101:20,
103:15, 103:21, 104:22, 117:22, 122:25
 sic [3] - 95:8, 95:9, 141:14
 side [15] - 27:21, 29:8, 33:4, 38:22,
61:21, 72:17, 75:20, 89:4, 91:4, 100:11,
107:12, 117:20, 267:11, 267:21, 316:19
 sides [3] - 13:4, 74:19, 92:7
 sign [1] - 141:20
 signal [1] - 185:17
 signals [2] - 187:13, 195:18
 significant [10] - 56:4, 56:6, 95:12,
142:9, 142:10, 143:15, 146:16, 216:20,
276:8, 276:24
 significantly [1] - 57:23
 silent [1] - 59:20
```

```
silicon [2] - 170:20, 177:20
 similar [3] - 257:10, 276:11, 279:15
 similarities [1] - 257:13
 similarly [1] - 81:7
 Simon [7] - 270:6, 270:7, 270:11,
272:9, 272:20, 273:9
 simple [1] - 111:2
 simplicity's [1] - 99:22
 simply [9] - 9:25, 36:25, 55:23, 74:16,
78:5, 161:23, 260:23, 268:12, 314:10
 simulations [1] - 192:7
 simulator [4] - 191:20, 191:23, 192:1,
199:10
 simultaneously [1] - 184:13
 single [8] - 109:8, 132:19, 140:1,
147:10, 158:21, 246:9, 317:8, 317:23
 sit [7] - 11:16, 12:10, 29:1, 30:16,
47:15, 71:5, 93:8
 sitting [9] - 11:21, 12:10, 14:22, 18:4,
45:6, 54:25, 175:11, 316:14, 316:16
 situation [6] - 32:12, 32:13, 59:23,
66:14, 183:3, 320:11
 situations [3] - 37:23, 40:23, 65:10
 six [3] - 21:12, 69:13, 212:1
 size [1] - 218:20
 skill [2] - 86:15, 311:10
 slaps [1] - 130:21
 sleep [1] - 17:18
 sleeves [1] - 291:23
 slide [1] - 35:3
 slides [2] - 35:7, 130:7
 slightly [6] - 35:18, 66:13, 99:7,
105:22, 182:7, 218:8
 slow [5] - 164:21, 164:23, 164:25,
165:1, 218:11
 small [6] - 96:2, 116:6, 134:2, 157:10,
170:1, 284:18
 smaller [5] - 55:24, 55:25, 99:19, 129:6,
284:16
 Smith [1] - 17:10
 smoke [1] - 47:21
 smooth [1] - 72:6
 SMU [1] - 21:2
 sniper [3] - 139:6, 143:5, 222:18
 snipers [1] - 143:6
 so-called [1] - 148:12
 so.. [7] - 24:10, 24:21, 54:14, 61:8,
155:21, 189:5, 249:25
 social [1] - 78:14
 society [1] - 143:20
 softball [1] - 16:15
 software [14] - 108:9, 146:11, 146:13,
201:6, 201:20, 206:7, 206:13, 214:22,
215:2, 215:4, 218:3, 221:4, 223:10,
286:14
 sold [18] - 102:12, 104:2, 105:16,
118:11, 118:21, 123:19, 124:2, 154:5,
157:9, 162:11, 222:15, 223:3, 230:12,
238:7, 241:2, 254:10, 262:15, 290:20
 soldered [1] - 222:11
```

```
sole [2] - 172:1, 172:7
 solely [3] - 9:3, 29:2, 85:24
 solution [1] - 187:16
 Solutions [2] - 89:5, 199:2
 solve [5] - 95:5, 186:23, 229:10,
246.18 247.14
 solved [1] - 246:17
 solving [1] - 247:12
 someone [14] - 14:13, 63:6, 83:9,
83:21, 155:15, 185:20, 224:17, 247:7,
252:21, 258:7, 258:13, 267:25, 268:6
 sometime [1] - 269:7
 sometimes [25] - 18:9, 37:21, 37:22,
38:9, 38:11, 39:1, 39:5, 40:23, 42:21,
43:22, 44:25, 45:1, 76:1, 76:4, 109:11,
123:24, 185:17, 186:7, 237:2, 244:6,
247:25, 261:15, 261:21, 297:25
 somewhere [6] - 60:13, 184:5, 189:22,
193:1, 214:12, 317:9
 son [3] - 16:16, 20:10, 20:19
 SONET [4] - 195:11, 195:16, 195:17,
197:16
 sons [1] - 19:5
 soon [1] - 291:11
 \textbf{sophisticated}~ [2] \textbf{ - } 96\text{:}4,~96\text{:}9
 sorry [25] - 31:9, 31:10, 37:17, 43:17,
54:8, 58:18, 60:18, 66:21, 68:20, 69:17,
97:10, 149:2, 153:2, 159:22, 162:18,
163:8, 181:22, 218:10, 218:13, 235:17,
269:1, 273:11, 279:13, 303:16, 321:15
 sort [23] - 10:23, 80:22, 139:12, 143:1,
144:21, 146:2, 146:7, 170:12, 175:19,
177:22, 178:23, 181:3, 187:15, 188:1,
191:8, 220:5, 242:11, 255:2, 273:24,
277:6, 277:14, 318:4, 319:24
 sorts [4] - 82:18, 220:22, 230:17,
 sought [3] - 84:6, 146:4, 317:3
 sounds [4] - 177:22, 245:18, 314:17,
322:9
 source [8] - 102:8, 233:24, 242:3,
242:5, 250:1, 250:6, 258:14
 South [1] - 283:6
 south [1] - 34:7
 spam [1] - 139:4
 spare [16] - 15:16, 15:17, 15:23, 16:15,
16:24, 17:5, 17:11, 19:20, 20:2, 21:3,
21:17, 21:25, 22:9, 23:4, 23:12, 30:1
 speaking [2] - 113:14, 133:4
 speaks [3] - 119:18, 201:3, 304:14
 special [2] - 101:5, 122:23
 Special [1] - 283:2
 specialized [5] - 25:21, 114:25, 120:20,
126:21, 229:10
 specific [31] - 13:17, 26:1, 36:1, 61:2,
85:8, 101:11, 101:16, 115:3, 117:25,
120:9, 120:24, 172:17, 185:21, 189:17,
191:6, 196:3, 196:12, 196:21, 197:7,
197:20, 201:3, 201:13, 201:23, 231:15,
241:19, 267:15, 267:25, 308:9, 317:6,
```

```
319:20. 322:17
 specifically [26] - 9:2, 32:17, 32:23,
32:24, 33:16, 35:10, 45:10, 60:1,
102:19, 103:7, 153:13, 161:11, 167:8,
171:25, 181:10, 200:13, 230:14, 231:20,
235:2, 236:8, 248:21, 276:5, 277:4,
294:19, 312:25, 321:17
 specification [10] - 84:15, 84:17, 89:13,
89:15, 142:3, 200:18, 249:5, 249:6,
249:8. 288:6
 specifications [1] - 200:20
 specifics [3] - 190:3, 196:23, 209:10
 speech [6] - 217:19, 221:8, 223:9,
223:14, 228:8, 251:9
 speed [7] - 142:19, 147:10, 164:13,
164:17, 186:24, 188:5, 197:14
 speeds [2] - 164:19, 188:22
 spell [1] - 221:14
 spelled [1] - 210:20
 Spencer [2] - 16:7, 24:14
 spend [12] - 16:5, 17:5, 17:11, 17:17,
18:21, 19:13, 20:3, 22:19, 46:4, 211:9,
244:3, 276:3
 spends [1] - 225:10
 spent [15] - 70:18, 102:4, 118:5, 118:6,
133:3, 171:10, 174:6, 187:23, 203:9,
203:12, 203:23, 204:1, 204:2, 204:5,
258:16
 spin [3] - 171:3, 215:11, 220:17
 spin-off [1] - 171:3
 spinout [3] - 170:12, 220:19, 223:8
 spinouts [1] - 144:23
 spit [1] - 97:5
 split [2] - 139:9, 167:15
 split-up [1] - 167:15
 spoken [2] - 223:15, 223:18
 spouse [3] - 15:7, 16:4, 20:17
 spouse's [7] - 15:5, 15:12, 16:13,
16:19, 17:21, 20:6, 20:14
 spreadsheet [1] - 252:16
 spring [2] - 94:3, 109:25
 spun [5] - 164:5, 164:9, 215:13, 223:7,
223:21
 spurious [2] - 180:1, 180:2
 St [1] - 169:15
 stack [1] - 199:14
 staff [2] - 11:23, 284:10
 stage [2] - 216:8, 262:3
 stages [1] - 184:11
 stake [2] - 154:1, 242:11
 stamp [2] - 269:13, 275:23
 stamped [1] - 269:17
 stand [20] - 8:25, 9:1, 23:23, 26:4,
26:11, 34:13, 34:24, 38:10, 61:13, 71:7,
71:9, 71:11, 71:13, 71:15, 71:17, 71:19,
71:21, 93:10, 258:11, 260:21
 standard [9] - 91:5, 91:20, 91:23, 92:4,
185:16, 187:12, 196:4, 209:17, 305:1
 stands [1] - 140:3
 Stanford [3] - 169:18, 169:19, 170:5
```

```
stark [28] - 109:13, 109:16, 109:20,
109:22, 118:18, 118:20, 122:11, 122:22,
123:9, 123:18, 123:20, 123:22, 124:4,
126:6, 126:10, 126:13, 126:17, 253:8,
309:10, 310:4, 310:21, 312:21, 313:20,
314:8, 314:18, 315:2, 316:6
 Stark [3] - 28:11, 108:23, 118:1
 stark's [6] - 111:4, 123:19, 124:18,
125:18, 308:21, 309:18
 start [24] - 12:2, 13:10, 26:17, 45:21,
84:12, 98:9, 132:23, 144:24, 145:1,
147:21, 148:16, 180:11, 188:13, 188:17,
213:23, 216:16, 216:17, 220:19, 244:23,
284:20, 293:6, 317:25, 324:10
 start-up [5] - 144:24, 145:1, 216:16,
216:17, 220:19
 start-ups [1] - 216:17
 started [25] - 46:22, 95:16, 99:14,
114:15, 118:17, 129:10, 144:11, 148:17,
161:22, 170:9, 171:13, 186:12, 211:10,
211:14, 213:9, 213:12, 214:5, 215:2,
215:17,\, 255:19,\, 284:8,\, 284:12,\, 289:7,\,
294.8
 starting [7] - 169:12, 186:17, 188:15,
192:12, 257:21, 257:22
 starts [2] - 100:7, 264:4
 startups [1] - 216:9
 state [18] - 12:9, 50:2, 159:7, 182:12,
182:24, 182:25, 183:1, 183:2, 183:13,
183:20, 183:21, 184:2, 184:5, 184:24,
191:17, 196:13, 282:23, 282:24
 stateless [2] - 184:8, 184:17
 statement [14] - 8:20, 13:2, 13:4, 38:2,
38:6, 38:18, 39:15, 39:18, 39:22, 41:2,
62:12, 62:14, 75:6, 89:9
 \pmb{statements}\ [8]\ \textbf{-}\ 7\text{:}21,\ 68\text{:}2,\ 72\text{:}18,
74:23, 74:25, 75:1, 92:20, 307:9
 States [12] - 11:12, 83:17, 94:19, 97:14,
99:24, 105:17, 113:3, 138:22, 211:25,
218:17, 266:19, 283:12
 Station [2] - 18:1, 18:13
 station [1] - 284:4
 stay [1] - 24:16
 stayed [4] - 109:23, 170:10, 170:15,
212:12
 stays [1] - 29:22
 step [3] - 183:12, 273:16
 stepdaughter [1] - 17:16
 Stephanie [1] - 282:13
 STEPHEN [3] - 135:19, 155:1, 165:11
 Stephen [5] - 22:8, 135:9, 135:24,
258:6, 258:9
 steps [1] - 273:6
 Steve [3] - 28:5, 166:19, 219:18
 Steven [1] - 17:13
 still [10] - 110:1, 122:23, 141:19,
144:13, 184:24, 221:7, 221:18, 248:14,
284:2, 314:3
 stipulated [1] - 74:20
 stipulation [3] - 40:18, 74:18
```

```
stipulations [1] - 74:12
 Stock [1] - 138:1
 stock [15] - 31:5, 31:8, 64:22, 65:2,
65:12, 65:20, 65:25, 66:6, 66:17,
242:14, 242:16, 242:19, 242:22, 242:23
 stole [1] - 63:6
 stolen [2] - 10:22, 10:23
 Stone [13] - 28:7, 102:4, 102:18,
102:22, 103:2, 103:9, 103:11, 103:21,
111:2, 291:4, 291:10, 300:1
 stones [1] - 24:8
 stood [1] - 213:15
 stop [8] - 10:18, 108:14, 191:7, 191:8,
191:10, 191:15, 244:18, 284:20
 stoppages [1] - 191:14
 stopped [2] - 191:16, 229:14
 storage [1] - 179:21
 store [7] - 19:11, 97:25, 175:15,
175:18, 175:22, 176:3, 206:25
 storied [4] - 95:7, 217:4, 217:5, 232:16
 story [1] - 114:12
 Stow [1] - 136:7
 STRAG_000008976 [1] - 198:22
 Stragent [115] - 8:21, 13:2, 25:16,
25:19, 27:1, 35:15, 50:12, 53:3, 53:10,
55:19, 73:8, 73:10, 73:19, 73:20, 74:2,
83:24, 87:17, 87:20, 88:1, 88:12, 89:6,
91:9, 91:17, 91:18, 93:24, 96:2, 100:2,
105:1, 114:21, 114:23, 133:25, 153:25,
155:23, 157:10, 162:1, 162:7, 162:24,
163:12, 203:7, 238:7, 238:9, 238:12,
239:8, 240:16, 240:23, 241:3, 250:7,
257:11, 257:15, 258:8, 259:4, 259:8,
259:23, 262:1, 266:18, 285:6, 285:7,
285:8, 285:9, 285:10, 285:14, 285:17,
285:18, 285:20, 285:25, 286:4, 286:7,
286:21, 286:22, 287:3, 287:7, 288:7,
288:15, 288:25, 289:4, 289:11, 289:13,
289:20, 290:14, 290:15, 290:21, 290:25,
291:14, 291:20, 291:21, 292:9, 292:16,
293:1, 293:4, 293:7, 294:21, 295:16,
296:6, 296:8, 296:12, 296:14, 297:5,
297:11, 297:13, 297:14, 298:2, 298:5,
298:6, 298:15, 298:17, 298:24, 299:3,
300:6, 300:22, 303:15, 306:14, 313:23,
322:23, 323:2
 Stragent's [11] - 73:25, 259:13, 259:18,
262:22, 269:1, 290:5, 296:9, 296:25,
297:21, 298:3, 312:23
 straight [1] - 107:18
 strategically [1] - 215:5
 Strategy [1] - 259:13
 strategy [5] - 224:6, 226:23, 258:18,
285:12
 strays [1] - 316:11
 stream [4] - 154:6, 162:4, 162:7, 234:8
 streaming [1] - 245:16
 Street [1] - 26:21
 stretch [1] - 134:22
 stricken [5] - 64:16, 64:17, 64:20, 76:5,
```

```
strictly [2] - 54:5, 320:10
 strike [4] - 37:19, 64:23, 69:4, 167:6
 strikes [4] - 61:1, 69:15, 69:16, 70:3
 striking [3] - 69:1, 69:9, 69:13
 string [1] - 287:2
 striping [1] - 16:4
 strong [2] - 36:25, 91:6
 stronger [2] - 129:11, 130:6
 strongly [17] - 10:18, 37:4, 37:8, 38:1,
38:5, 38:18, 38:21, 38:23, 39:12, 39:15,
39:21, 40:17, 41:2, 44:2, 44:7, 55:22,
55:25
 structures [1] - 233:18
 struggling [1] - 284:16
 Stuart [1] - 286:2
 students [1] - 137:13
 studied [4] - 159:4, 159:7, 165:5,
 study [3] - 19:20, 212:6, 241:8
 studying [2] - 198:5, 200:1
 stuff [4] - 122:20, 125:9, 192:7, 200:2
 style [1] - 119:11
 sub [1] - 183:25
 sub-blocks [1] - 183:25
 subcomponent [1] - 207:20
 subject [13] - 59:7, 59:8, 86:13, 95:7,
138:25, 168:16, 188:25, 251:1, 278:3,
280:5, 283:18, 290:16, 295:3
 subjects [2] - 58:7
 submit [2] - 313:2, 313:8
 submitted [6] - 85:19, 173:23, 306:24,
312:21, 312:24
 subpoena [1] - 204:6
 subsequent [2] - 148:22, 273:4
 subsequently [2] - 141:23, 274:15
 subset [1] - 206:19
 substance [3] - 275:5, 279:10, 279:14
 substantial [1] - 24:19
 substantially [2] - 36:4, 142:13
 substantive [1] - 274:14
 substitute [1] - 74:14
 substructure [1] - 187:12
 suburb [1] - 211:7
 succeed [1] - 227:12
 successful [2] - 114:3, 146:14
 such-and-such [1] - 189:8
 sudden [1] - 317:24
 sue [4] - 84:7, 225:18, 253:10, 297:19
 sued [7] - 36:16, 36:19, 39:11, 40:2,
73:9, 105:4
 sues [1] - 55:24
 suffice [1] - 312:16
 suggest [11] - 103:23, 110:3, 113:1,
133:19, 181:23, 186:22, 252:20, 261:7,
280:8, 322:12, 322:22
 suggested [9] - 129:2, 158:18, 159:13,
247:17, 247:22, 247:23, 249:20, 255:12,
256:8
```

```
suggestion [1] - 9:23
 suggestions [1] - 8:13
 suggests [2] - 101:18, 178:12
 suing [4] - 40:8, 83:23, 225:24, 258:7
 suit [4] - 25:15, 25:17, 56:15, 87:4
 sum [6] - 131:8, 317:8, 319:6, 320:14,
322:2, 322:21
 summarizes [1] - 270:14
 summary [3] - 87:14, 244:5, 244:9
 summer [7] - 21:24, 95:1, 99:15,
146:24, 189:19, 189:20, 189:24
 summers [1] - 169:25
 sums [1] - 134:1
 Super [4] - 19:12, 23:2, 147:3, 148:12
 supervision [2] - 272:18
 supervisor [3] - 16:21, 18:10, 20:17
 supplemental [7] - 308:20, 311:4,
312:20, 312:25, 313:2, 313:8, 317:1
 supplied [1] - 184:6
 supplies [3] - 170:1, 170:4
 supply [1] - 81:7
 support [5] - 194:25, 249:8, 310:11,
311:5, 311:6
 supported [1] - 249:6
 supposed [9] - 79:10, 84:20, 132:11,
132:12, 176:10, 179:25, 180:23, 182:19,
 supposedly [1] - 313:3
 surgery [1] - 23:25
 surprised [3] - 261:2, 274:6, 277:8
 surveying [1] - 21:22
 suspect [1] - 203:5
 suspicion [2] - 160:4, 203:6
 suspicions [1] - 241:12
 sustain [1] - 296:1
 sustained [1] - 296:21
 swayed [1] - 247:10
 switch [10] - 129:22, 132:22, 132:25,
147:10, 175:6, 185:15, 185:20, 188:5,
188:12, 291:10
 switch/router [1] - 186:25
 switches [2] - 175:7, 175:8
 switching [1] - 175:3
 sworn [3] - 72:22, 74:8, 117:11
 synchronous [1] - 195:14
 SynQor[1] - 311:14
 system [18] - 12:13, 22:15, 33:21, 49:6,
49:12, 49:13, 62:25, 79:12, 125:16,
143:6, 143:8, 173:3, 173:4, 214:1,
217:19, 221:8, 222:18, 252:12
 systems [5] - 97:22, 198:7, 213:16,
213:17, 222:17
```

Т

T-ball [1] - 16:16 **tab** [6] - 80:7, 81:10, 148:5, 163:6, 288:13, 296:5 **table** [5] - 26:25, 199:12, 238:14, 263:9,

suggesting [1] - 189:7

telephony [3] - 187:4, 187:10, 195:18

ten [8] - 52:1, 63:18, 63:23, 67:24, 68:3,

Teradyne [5] - 214:14, 214:18, 214:21,

tens [3] - 268:11, 272:14, 280:24

television [2] - 21:4, 53:20

142:18, 160:22, 302:1

tend [1] - 55:24

tends [1] - 10:24

tera [1] - 214:16

214:23, 215:11

terabit [1] - 186:24

```
280:18
 tabs [2] - 81:22, 287:12
 takeaway [2] - 227:1, 227:4
 Talbert [4] - 16:18, 16:19, 41:21, 58:20
 talks [14] - 95:9, 103:12, 103:16,
103:17, 103:18, 104:19, 119:7, 162:14,
178:4, 194:11, 194:15, 264:12, 308:20,
319:8
 tall [1] - 18:9
 target [1] - 31:20
 task [2] - 75:25, 88:7
 tasked [1] - 186:20
 TDM [1] - 187:12
 teach [5] - 16:16, 119:9, 123:18,
124:22, 211:14
 teacher [5] - 15:6, 16:5, 18:19, 22:25,
23:1
 teachings [1] - 19:21
 Team [1] - 212:23
 team [4] - 212:25, 215:20, 227:18,
299:24
 teams [1] - 116:2
 teamwork [1] - 115:25
 tech [2] - 32:5, 146:21
 technical [18] - 138:12, 138:14, 138:16,
138:18, 138:19, 138:20, 139:8, 139:10,
139:14, 143:23, 145:4, 146:24, 174:22,
174:23, 215:8, 268:9, 274:8, 277:7
 technicalese [1] - 221:2
 technically [2] - 169:18, 186:10
 technician [2] - 16:20, 19:17
 technicians [1] - 115:24
 technique [1] - 129:25
 techniques [1] - 224:18
 technological [2] - 143:13, 217:15
 technologically [1] - 146:3
 Technologies [3] - 94:11, 137:4,
275:17
 technologies [3] - 140:24, 141:16,
142:21
 technologist [3] - 138:12, 153:7,
215:18
 technologists [1] - 139:12
 technology [53] - 44:1, 95:12, 95:25,
96:20, 114:3, 114:22, 115:1, 115:8,
115:11, 115:14, 116:5, 116:21, 117:2,
117:6, 117:14, 117:15, 126:9, 126:23,
132:18, 139:25, 140:8, 156:11, 157:21,
161:14, 162:8, 164:10, 186:5, 211:15,
218:2, 219:19, 220:22, 221:5, 221:6,
221:25, 222:24, 223:6, 223:9, 223:19,
224:4, 224:9, 247:4, 249:20, 256:17,
267:9, 283:21, 283:25, 284:13, 291:18,
291:24, 292:1, 292:15, 297:24, 298:2
 Technology [5] - 95:14, 115:18,
136:12, 143:24, 212:5
 teenaged [1] - 30:18
```

telecom [1] - 245:16

telecommunications [1] - 245:15

telephone [3] - 137:24, 187:12, 216:23

```
teradyne [1] - 214:15
 term [6] - 80:21, 80:24, 89:24, 196:2,
201:14, 234:3
 terminal [1] - 146:20
 Terminology [1] - 80:9
 terminology [2] - 81:3, 90:21
 terms [22] - 10:24, 80:15, 80:18, 84:20,
90:9, 100:19, 160:17, 162:4, 203:14,
233:19, 240:15, 247:21, 257:20, 269:13,
272:20, 276:6, 289:5, 289:16, 293:22,
294:3, 314:6, 323:14
 Terms [1] - 81:1
 ternary [1] - 151:14
 terrible [1] - 260:6
 terribly [1] - 178:20
 Terry [1] - 19:2
 test [2] - 214:24, 215:4
 tested [3] - 52:19, 52:20, 244:25
 testified [1] - 294:6
 testifies [3] - 123:10, 315:2, 315:3
 testify [14] - 38:11, 93:7, 108:23,
109:14, 267:1, 303:8, 303:9, 306:8,
314:18, 321:3, 323:12, 323:16, 323:18,
323:20
 testifying [5] - 266:22, 266:23, 294:8,
316:7, 317:16
 TESTIMONY [2] - 169:6, 266:15
 testimony [40] - 9:5, 9:16, 72:21, 74:8,
74:9, 74:10, 74:14, 74:15, 74:16, 77:3,
77:6, 77:9, 77:11, 81:6, 81:19, 82:6,
82:10, 93:8, 93:9, 110:5, 134:4, 152:21,
153:11, 197:1, 204:3, 293:15, 295:23,
301:20, 304:13, 308:5, 309:13, 309:16,
316:18, 320:20, 321:1, 321:20, 322:8,
322:21, 323:4
 testing [5] - 214:22, 214:24, 215:2,
215:20, 245:16
 Texans [3] - 44:17, 44:18, 44:21
 TEXAS [1] - 6:2
 Texas [16] - 11:13, 11:16, 17:25, 18:1,
20:7, 20:19, 20:25, 21:1, 22:7, 23:10,
27:7, 45:1, 45:17, 109:24, 266:20,
266:23
 text [8] - 78:19, 119:7, 174:1, 174:5,
174:7, 176:18, 223:13, 278:16
 Thanksgiving [1] - 222:10
 THAT [1] - 324:14
 THE [207] - 6:6, 6:20, 7:2, 7:7, 7:10,
7:15, 7:20, 8:1, 8:17, 9:11, 9:19, 10:4,
```

10:6, 10:9, 10:14, 11:5, 11:10, 15:10, 15:18, 16:1, 16:11, 16:17, 17:1, 17:7, 17:12, 17:19, 18:5, 18:16, 18:23, 19:7, 19:14, 19:22, 20:4, 20:12, 20:22, 21:6, 21:18, 22:2, 22:12, 22:21, 23:6, 23:14, 24:12, 24:17, 24:22, 24:25, 25:7, 25:13, 26:7, 27:4, 27:15, 28:9, 28:19, 31:12, 33:3, 45:14, 47:3, 51:10, 62:18, 63:9, 63:11, 63:20, 63:21, 64:2, 64:10, 64:12, 64:17, 65:5, 65:18, 66:2, 66:10, 66:22, 66:25, 67:6, 67:16, 67:21, 67:24, 68:5, 68:9, 68:18, 68:22, 69:6, 69:14, 69:18, 69:21, 69:23, 70:1, 70:5, 70:8, 70:13, 72:3, 72:12, 72:15, 79:21, 92:25, 93:4, 93:6, 93:14, 93:17, 113:11, 134:13, 135:4, 135:11, 135:16, 135:18, 135:20, 152:22, 153:4, 153:14, 154:20, 154:24, 165:8, 166:7, 168:10, 168:12, 168:20, 168:22, 168:23, 169:5, 209:21, 209:24, 210:5, 210:12, 210:17, 243:3, 243:5, 261:10, 262:9, 265:17, 265:19, 265:23, 265:25, 266:1, 266:7, 266:8, 266:16, 281:3, 281:8, 281:12, 281:19, 281:22, 282:2, 282:6, 293:25, 294:5, 294:11, 294:23, 295:6, 296:1, 296:21, 301:7, 301:12, 301:14, 301:15, 302:9, 302:22, 303:1, 303:6, 303:13, 304:9, 304:18, 304:21, 305:6, 305:16, 305:23, 306:1, 306:6, 306:11, 306:17, 306:20, 307:6, 307:15, 307:20, 308:4, 308:13, 308:16, 309:2, 309:5, 309:20, 310:7, 310:10, 310:15, 311:20, 313:12, 314:16, 315:7, 315:10, 316:2, 316:13, 316:22, 317:15, 317:20, 318:8, 318:20, 318:24, 319:7, 319:18, 320:16, 320:24, 322:5, 322:7, 323:15, 323:24, 324:3, 324:5, 324:15 theatre [1] - 21:4 theirs [1] - 231:15 themselves [5] - 26:11, 58:25, 162:11, 166:16, 174:16 theoretical [2] - 177:2, 178:15 theoretically [1] - 185:1 theories [1] - 222:7 theory [1] - 178:19 therapist [1] - 22:15 thereby [2] - 125:1, 132:15 therefore [4] - 66:18, 121:1, 183:8, 318:3 **Theresa** [1] - 17:3 they've [7] - 87:22, 104:17, 304:25, 313:1, 314:7, 318:4, 322:10 thinking [6] - 45:6, 62:1, 124:17, 129:10, 188:9, 201:15 thinks [1] - 14:12 third [8] - 104:22, 114:19, 183:12, 227:20, 234:16, 268:19, 270:20, 271:5 THIS [1] - 324:14 thousand [2] - 116:3, 240:23 thousands [1] - 268:11 Thousands [2] - 142:7, 146:17 threaten [3] - 162:7, 256:11, 261:13

```
threatening [1] - 258:7
 three [44] - 16:21, 19:3, 19:12, 21:12,
23:1, 25:3, 25:8, 26:23, 48:1, 48:5,
73:21, 80:5, 80:10, 85:1, 85:4, 87:7,
88:6, 88:8, 113:8, 113:21, 115:16,
115:23, 136:4, 139:9, 144:14, 150:23,
151:7, 151:9, 151:12, 151:15, 173:9,
192:22, 194:12, 210:25, 220:2, 240:5,
262:19, 287:2, 287:12, 287:22, 288:7,
320:2
 three-way [1] - 151:15
 throughout [3] - 27:2, 116:9, 290:23
 time-consuming [3] - 56:5, 56:7, 77:7
 timeline [1] - 99:11
 timer [1] - 29:13
 timing [1] - 176:4
 TIMOTHY [1] - 6:2
 Timothy [1] - 11:14
 tinkerers [2] - 42:22, 43:23
 title [7] - 119:7, 138:11, 145:8, 158:12,
215:16, 267:8, 275:16
 titled [1] - 119:1
 titles [3] - 255:7, 255:9
 today [54] - 6:11, 8:4, 12:15, 25:9,
47:11, 47:12, 50:11, 50:13, 53:23,
59:17, 59:19, 59:22, 60:2, 70:18, 70:23,
72:6, 95:10, 96:2, 109:24, 112:16,
113:14, 113:20, 114:9, 114:19, 115:7,
116:6, 128:13, 130:14, 134:3, 138:6,
153:19, 169:9, 170:20, 186:12, 189:13,
202:24, 203:23, 204:3, 221:18, 223:22,
243:11, 244:23, 263:5, 286:3, 286:19,
287:9, 287:17, 287:19, 289:7, 291:9,
298:9, 301:19, 302:4, 307:1
 today's [1] - 97:17
 together [22] - 8:14, 11:19, 119:10,
129:20, 131:7, 134:20, 146:8, 158:15,
182:16, 216:13, 216:16, 228:9, 228:13,
230:24, 231:15, 255:1, 260:7, 286:25,
299:24, 304:3, 304:7, 309:12
 Tom [1] - 11:25
 Tomlinson [1] - 141:19
 tomorrow [4] - 301:13, 302:5, 316:16,
323:11
 tone [1] - 226:4
 TONYA [1] - 324:20
 Tonya [1] - 11:24
 took [14] - 93:10, 105:5, 122:19, 124:4,
144:20, 162:1, 167:18, 202:4, 203:16,
226:19, 227:25, 255:16, 255:20, 291:25
 top [9] - 101:8, 103:12, 111:6, 122:19,
175:14, 179:7, 180:18, 198:25, 205:15
 top-secret [1] - 103:12
 topic [3] - 9:16, 83:4, 315:9
```

topics [1] - 113:21

total [6] - 69:13, 169:2, 203:19, 203:21,

towards [4] - 119:11, 169:4, 178:3,

tops [1] - 185:12

toward [1] - 169:3

266:12, 287:3

```
258:21
 town [1] - 136:6
 tracking [1] - 139:6
 trade [1] - 99:6
 trade-off [1] - 99:6
 traded [1] - 137:25
 Trademark [6] - 56:23, 83:6, 84:8,
94:19, 97:14, 99:24
 traffic [1] - 23:10
 transaction [1] - 109:21
 transactional [1] - 267:20
 transactions [1] - 87:18
 transcript [1] - 77:2
 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 324:15
 transcription [1] - 223:16
 transfer [1] - 273:17
 translate [1] - 121:4
 translator [1] - 119:17
 transmission [1] - 195:18
 Transport [1] - 195:14
 transportation [1] - 21:11
 travel [1] - 16:6
 traveling [1] - 23:3
 Travis [1] - 16:19
 treated [2] - 57:22, 74:15
 trial [42] - 9:4, 13:8, 26:24, 27:2, 29:2,
29:3, 30:5, 38:12, 48:15, 72:23, 73:4,
73:7, 75:14, 76:8, 76:13, 76:18, 76:20,
76:22, 77:3, 77:20, 77:21, 77:23, 77:24,
78:16, 78:22, 79:1, 79:8, 81:15, 83:7,
83:20, 89:21, 92:12, 99:1, 226:11,
244:25, 245:2, 245:4, 288:11, 290:17,
290:25, 299:12, 307:14
 trials [1] - 81:23
 tried [5] - 124:19, 157:3, 237:17, 253:3,
291:23
 tries [2] - 142:18, 262:21
 trillion [1] - 214:17
 Trinity [1] - 22:24
 Trombone [1] - 220:25
 troops [2] - 143:4, 143:7
 truck [2] - 17:14, 21:9
 true [27] - 74:20, 74:21, 155:17, 157:12,
158:24, 159:17, 159:25, 160:22, 161:19,
161:20, 162:2, 196:14, 206:9, 206:14,
208:3, 208:13, 208:15, 208:17, 209:9,
237:7, 254:12, 258:8, 262:7, 279:6,
309:22, 312:19, 313:13
 truth [1] - 38:22
 try [21] - 8:7, 37:20, 67:24, 77:16,
116:10, 173:13, 187:18, 227:22, 233:4,
246:18, 246:23, 248:24, 253:4, 256:21,
256:22, 260:1, 281:8, 293:21, 293:23,
320:5, 320:9
 trying [22] - 27:8, 43:24, 50:1, 88:19,
92:12, 123:17, 127:22, 176:19, 186:20,
186:23, 193:8, 197:16, 233:25, 248:5,
248:15, 260:2, 267:14, 299:9, 312:12,
```

```
Tukwila [3] - 116:12, 116:19, 127:9
 Tupelo [1] - 98:5
 turn [18] - 23:16, 29:7, 53:12, 112:21,
147:11, 147:16, 147:20, 148:4, 148:18,
152:8, 218:5, 239:2, 239:4, 259:16,
287:12, 288:19, 296:11, 300:3
 turnaround [1] - 276:6
 turned [3] - 27:14, 221:17, 254:10
 turns [3] - 117:5, 125:17, 237:22
 TV [3] - 21:25, 55:10
 twenty [1] - 287:5
 twice [2] - 314:8, 321:10
 twins [1] - 282:14
 Twitter [1] - 78:15
 Two [2] - 142:7, 146:17
 two [123] - 7:5, 10:1, 12:9, 15:8, 15:14,
15:22, 16:9, 17:3, 17:15, 17:24, 18:12,
18:19, 19:19, 20:9, 20:18, 21:2, 21:13,
21:14, 21:23, 22:6, 22:16, 25:19, 30:15,
33:3, 59:3, 59:4, 59:6, 59:16, 62:18,
64:20, 70:19, 73:24, 79:12, 79:23,
87:15, 90:1, 94:15, 96:1, 97:9, 97:10,
97:15, 99:21, 103:15, 104:17, 105:1,
105:2, 105:12, 106:15, 106:19, 106:22,
107:15, 107:19, 107:20, 108:21, 108:24,
109:3, 110:14, 110:21, 111:7, 111:9,
112:13, 113:3, 118:5, 118:9, 118:15,
121:18, 122:3, 122:4, 122:14, 124:11,
128:14, 129:17, 129:18, 129:19, 131:5,
131:6, 131:14, 132:17, 133:25, 137:12,
145:15, 150:14, 152:18, 152:24, 165:1,
166:21, 179:9, 182:10, 182:15, 185:25,
193:17, 211:1, 211:19, 212:7, 214:12,
215:18, 218:9, 228:17, 234:23, 235:21,
245:1, 251:15, 255:16, 255:18, 263:19,
266:13, 272:1, 276:7, 282:14, 285:11,
287:2, 288:10, 290:24, 291:25, 292:23,
298:19, 299:14, 303:18, 319:2, 319:3,
320:1
 Tyler [8] - 26:21, 27:7, 38:14, 45:1,
45:17, 109:24, 266:20, 266:23
 TYLER [1] - 6:2
 type [5] - 52:17, 57:14, 99:17, 101:16,
187:5
 typed [1] - 228:15
 types [6] - 96:12, 96:17, 96:20, 101:12,
219:15, 231:4
 typical [1] - 184:18
 typically [9] - 139:20, 139:21, 142:3,
183:24, 184:22, 190:17, 195:23, 276:24,
277:10
 typo [2] - 179:12, 179:14
                    U
 U.S [6] - 56:23, 138:24, 139:21, 171:16,
```

193:25, 222:19

ultimate [7] - 99:19, 138:20, 217:8,

ultimately [18] - 12:16, 42:8, 72:8,

217:10, 273:5, 274:19, 320:12

322:25, 323:1, 323:9

Tuesday [2] - 8:7, 8:14

83:11, 102:12, 105:5, 138:18, 141:5, 151:24, 162:2, 193:17, 212:13, 212:15, 212:18, 214:6, 214:8, 223:7, 238:1 **UN** [1] - 137:15 unable [2] - 74:11, 161:4 unaware [1] - 161:9 uncertain [1] - 227:16 unchangeable [1] - 201:24 uncomfortable [1] - 49:15 under [15] - 38:16, 89:22, 158:10, 175:22, 193:24, 204:4, 214:12, 218:4, 222:6, 251:11, 264:1, 266:22, 272:5, 272:17, 313:3 undercurrent [1] - 319:22 undergone [1] - 216:19 undergrad [1] - 212:7 undergraduate [5] - 136:8, 136:16, 136:23, 212:2, 212:6 underlying [1] - 195:22 underneath [1] - 194:14 understood [8] - 69:8, 188:11, 259:22, 294:9, 309:25, 315:6, 316:21, 316:24 undertake [2] - 227:17, 268:17 undertaken [1] - 241:7 undertaking [1] - 126:4 undertook [1] - 222:11 underway [1] - 186:15 undoubtedly [1] - 78:14 unfair [2] - 36:11, 42:12 unfairly [1] - 57:23 union [1] - 21:1 unique [2] - 162:12, 166:3 unit [6] - 51:22, 130:24, 151:19, 185:21, 190:18, 214:16 Unit [1] - 199:1 United [13] - 11:12, 83:17, 94:19, 97:14, 99:24, 105:17, 113:3, 119:17, 138:22, 211:25, 218:16, 266:19, 283:12 units [5] - 176:14, 185:7, 185:9, 185:18, 222:11 University [5] - 136:25, 169:15, 169:19, 283:6, 283:9 UNIX [1] - 170:25 unless [7] - 25:1, 78:13, 244:17, 244:18, 256:4, 260:13, 301:8 unlikely [1] - 26:15 unreasonable [1] - 112:4 unrelated [2] - 238:8, 298:10 unroll [1] - 184:12 unsuccessful [1] - 161:23 unsurfacing [1] - 299:8 unusual [3] - 30:5, 52:24, 277:12 **up** [131] - 8:18, 13:11, 14:2, 14:4, 14:18, 18:8, 20:10, 21:17, 23:23, 23:24, 29:13, 31:1, 34:24, 35:3, 38:19, 49:21, 82:24, 90:16, 94:14, 96:18, 98:14, 100:11, 100:23, 101:20, 102:15, 106:21, 106:23, 110:24, 111:6, 111:23, 113:15, 115:7, 120:17, 121:10, 125:6, 126:10, 129:12, 129:15, 130:1, 130:4, 131:2, 131:10,

131:17, 131:23, 132:5, 138:9, 141:8, 144:17, 144:24, 145:1, 145:14, 157:10, 159:5, 164:17, 164:19, 167:15, 171:1, 174:14, 174:25, 175:14, 187:15, 187:16, 188:7, 189:14, 191:3, 193:19, 199:24, 205:2, 207:21, 215:12, 216:16, 216:17, 218:7, 218:18, 219:11, 220:16, 220:19, 221:4, 221:7, 222:13, 224:13, 226:10, 226:16, 227:9, 227:13, 229:1, 233:8, 234:2, 234:5, 234:7, 234:22, 238:16, 240:19, 240:20, 252:4, 252:7, 256:5, 256:14, 257:15, 258:11, 259:1, 262:7, 271:10, 271:13, 280:14, 282:14, 282:20, 282:22, 282:25, 284:10, 284:21, 284:22, 285:10, 285:16, 289:11, 289:23, 290:2, 291:22, 295:17, 299:17, 302:10, 305:4, 306:22, 308:2, 310:4, 313:24, 314:4, 315:3, 320:14, 324:8 **up-front** [7] - 157:10, 240:19, 240:20, 284:21, 284:22, 289:23, 290:2 updated [6] - 244:10, 244:11, 244:12, 244:16, 245:3, 302:20 updates [1] - 78:16 upper[1] - 207:21 ups [1] - 216:17 urge [1] - 66:24 urged [1] - 80:17 usages [1] - 198:1 useful [2] - 86:13, 119:19 uses [2] - 164:3, 274:9 usual [2] - 203:15, 203:17 utilized [1] - 292:14 utilizing [2] - 160:14, 291:23

V

vague [2] - 60:25, 189:18 vaguely [1] - 189:16 valid [20] - 49:3, 49:6, 84:9, 84:10, 86:12, 86:17, 86:20, 86:24, 87:8, 87:11, 88:9, 111:15, 113:5, 114:16, 117:5, 118:22, 118:24, 318:13, 318:15, 320:13 validation [1] - 145:17 validity [2] - 49:10, 49:14 Valley [1] - 22:24 valuable [4] - 228:1, 230:4, 247:6, 323:21 value [28] - 130:2, 130:3, 133:22, 134:7, 162:13, 164:13, 178:8, 182:12, 227:21, 229:11, 233:25, 234:4, 248:4, 252:13, 258:7, 259:19, 260:12, 260:23, 285:15, 299:3, 303:22, 304:2, 304:8, 304:13, 304:15, 305:20, 305:21 value-add [1] - 259:19 valued [1] - 246:8 values [1] - 252:14 Vanguard [1] - 31:20 variable [1] - 201:11 variant [1] - 195:8 varied [1] - 139:2

variety [4] - 38:12, 187:25, 233:17, 245:20 various [15] - 80:15, 89:10, 89:14, 141:24, 145:11, 176:13, 189:3, 202:18, 219:22, 219:23, 243:17, 244:1, 244:14, 251:1, 260:14 vast [3] - 126:25, 133:15, 139:5 vehemently [1] - 321:22 vehicle [1] - 283:22 vehicles [1] - 143:7 Vellturo [20] - 9:2, 28:7, 104:5, 104:6, 104:10, 104:24, 105:8, 105:10, 105:13, 106:12, 106:18, 303:8, 305:22, 306:7, 317:6, 318:2, 319:18, 320:17, 321:18 Vellturo's [1] - 303:19 venture [13] - 137:22, 216:3, 216:4, 216:5, 216:6, 216:9, 216:25, 217:3, 217:4, 217:9, 218:24, 227:17, 234:1 Ventures [4] - 231:12, 231:13, 231:19, 231:20 verdict [6] - 29:1, 66:18, 73:14, 74:5, 134.12 **verification** [1] - 164:19 verify [2] - 194:5, 300:2 Verizon [30] - 23:9, 137:24, 163:24, 164:2, 164:5, 167:14, 167:15, 167:19, 168:3, 168:7, 216:22, 217:1, 217:2, 225:9, 225:10, 225:20, 225:24, 226:11, 226:20, 227:3, 236:21, 237:1, 237:2, 237:3, 237:5, 237:7, 237:23, 246:3, 246:6, 248:15 versed [1] - 66:15 version [3] - 99:19, 195:9, 199:16 versions [1] - 197:15 versus [5] - 166:4, 226:20, 227:3, 266:19, 322:21 Vesta [1] - 16:18 veteran [1] - 17:10 veterinary [1] - 17:15 via [1] - 266:11 viable [1] - 188:11 vice [3] - 22:4, 112:12, 232:11 vice-president [3] - 22:4, 112:12, 232:11 Vicki [1] - 22:14 video [9] - 62:24, 83:4, 125:17, 169:5, 209:18, 223:11, 223:16, 223:17, 223:18 VIDEOGRAPHER [1] - 266:16 videotape [1] - 38:15 Videotape [1] - 266:17 videotaped [3] - 28:3, 74:10, 169:1 view [6] - 39:8, 72:19, 218:24, 308:21, 308:24 viewed [1] - 146:3 Viewette [1] - 29:24 views [2] - 78:17, 80:17 violate [1] - 92:13 violating [2] - 25:23, 92:9 virtue [2] - 168:3, 209:1

varies [1] - 140:16

White [1] - 144:7

vision [1] - 146:8 visit [7] - 30:24, 36:12, 144:9, 144:18, 238:24, 238:25, 289:8 vocabulary [1] - 120:14 vocational [1] - 19:1 voice [3] - 139:12, 226:9, 245:15 voice-over-IP [2] - 226:9, 245:15 voices [1] - 30:7 voir [1] - 113:25 **VOLUME** [1] - 6:1 Vonage [5] - 225:24, 225:25, 226:1, 226:20, 227:3 vote [1] - 63:5 W wafer [2] - 102:14 wafers [3] - 102:17, 104:1, 214:25 wait [3] - 6:10, 7:12, 131:22 waiting [2] - 130:21, 132:6 wake [1] - 23:24 walk [3] - 99:11, 102:18, 103:13 Wallace [1] - 31:10 Walmart [4] - 15:7, 16:22, 16:24, 21:16 **WALTER** [1] - 169:6 Walter [42] - 22:14, 28:4, 40:5, 41:17, 53:1, 54:22, 60:22, 87:16, 89:3, 94:10, 94:11, 94:13, 95:1, 95:15, 95:25, 98:21, 99:15, 100:9, 144:9, 144:10, 144:11, 145:9, 146:2, 149:4, 150:5, 150:12, 151:21, 154:13, 155:18, 158:24, 159:25, 160:18, 165:3, 166:19, 169:1, 171:16, 171:21, 241:16, 247:16, 249:16, 271:20 Walter's [1] - 157:1 wants [3] - 268:15, 268:16, 302:11 warm [1] - 11:13 warn [1] - 76:13 warranty [1] - 56:10 Washington [2] - 11:16, 169:14 wasted [1] - 72:6 watch [3] - 21:25, 38:15, 79:7 watched [1] - 62:24 water [1] - 16:21 ways [7] - 117:14, 118:3, 139:9, 209:16, 219:25, 224:2, 259:23 week [12] - 13:11, 13:13, 23:21, 24:9, 73:17, 94:2, 113:21, 162:19, 211:21, 272:25, 282:19, 313:14 weekend [1] - 222:10 weeks [1] - 235:11 weight [1] - 75:23 welcome [1] - 11:13 welcomed [1] - 11:11 well-being [1] - 115:16 well-known [3] - 196:3, 208:22, 209:16 west [1] - 136:6

whatsoever [2] - 279:24, 305:13

whereas [2] - 99:7, 130:1

whimsy [1] - 57:6

whole [14] - 41:7, 97:5, 99:12, 106:7, 115:7, 126:1, 248:2, 248:23, 278:19, 284:1, 304:2, 305:19, 312:22, 322:20 wholeheartedly [1] - 94:6 wide [2] - 187:25, 190:8 wider [1] - 190:19 width [2] - 190:15, 190:18 wife [13] - 15:13, 15:21, 18:10, 18:18, 19:18, 20:8, 21:1, 23:10, 29:21, 45:18, 136:3, 282:12, 282:15 wife's [7] - 15:20, 17:3, 18:7, 19:16, 20:24, 21:8, 23:8 willing [5] - 258:11, 258:13, 261:17, 262:1, 262:5 win [2] - 139:19, 145:14 Winner [1] - 213:5 winner [1] - 213:5 wins [2] - 91:15, 91:17 wireless [1] - 251:10 wise [1] - 61:16 wish [2] - 60:12, 81:18 wishes [1] - 188:1 withdraw [2] - 66:20, 66:23 witness [31] - 38:10, 72:21, 74:14, 74:16, 77:3, 82:7, 82:23, 135:14, 154:17, 154:19, 168:9, 168:16, 168:24, 226:10, 226:12, 227:3, 242:25, 243:16, 244:3, 244:13, 245:1, 263:2, 265:16, 265:20, 266:9, 281:5, 281:18, 301:6, 309:10 WITNESS [4] - 168:22, 265:25, 266:7, 301:14 witness' [2] - 82:6, 82:9 witnesses [24] - 13:5, 27:21, 27:23, 28:20, 38:9, 38:11, 73:7, 74:9, 74:10, 75:1, 77:15, 81:5, 81:7, 81:8, 81:20, 81:25, 93:3, 93:7, 93:10, 93:11, 103:1, 110:10, 323:20 Wizards [3] - 95:8, 141:14 woman [1] - 272:22 women [1] - 113:15 won [1] - 141:4 wondered [1] - 128:16 wonderful [1] - 18:3 wondering [1] - 29:14 Woodford [11] - 9:6, 28:12, 111:18, 112:5, 305:18, 317:7, 317:8, 317:12, 317:16, 319:25, 320:20 Woody [1] - 31:12 word [10] - 101:19, 117:19, 119:6, 160:25, 165:16, 165:17, 180:1, 232:14, 264:5 word-for-word [1] - 232:14 wording [3] - 174:20, 253:3, 253:4 words [16] - 41:5, 80:22, 86:16, 87:4, 101:3, 101:5, 121:25, 223:15, 223:18, 260:13, 261:20, 284:22, 285:11, 288:5, 303:10

works [22] - 15:14, 16:22, 16:23, 16:24, 17:16, 21:10, 21:24, 26:6, 32:19, 34:16, 51:8, 54:12, 84:19, 98:16, 110:1, 119:17, 128:13, 131:3, 141:19, 285:14, 313:19, 314:7 Workshop [4] - 211:11, 211:13, 211:18. 243:24 world [8] - 41:7, 52:11, 94:14, 96:5, 97:7, 97:17, 142:12, 147:13 world's [1] - 95:5 Worldwide [1] - 19:25 worried [2] - 254:1, 317:15 worry [3] - 75:25, 82:19, 85:5 worth [2] - 223:3, 305:13 Worth [2] - 26:22, 26:23 wound [2] - 171:1, 205:2 Wow [1] - 45:6 write [7] - 82:8, 112:22, 160:1, 192:12, 223:11, 248:18, 262:17 writing [1] - 270:9 written [18] - 59:6, 74:11, 76:25, 84:17, 102:7, 103:9, 120:10, 141:11, 141:13, 159:17, 212:25, 249:2, 249:8, 269:23, 269:24, 275:11, 279:1, 279:2 wrote [4] - 41:6, 165:19, 174:6, 248:14 X XOR [2] - 178:22, 179:1 Υ y'all [6] - 45:12, 48:7, 48:8, 96:25, 220:22, 227:24 Yahoo [1] - 300:9 year [20] - 23:4, 95:12, 140:16, 143:22, 145:3, 169:17, 170:14, 171:10, 189:19, 211:19, 214:11, 221:21, 221:22, 225:11, 234:6, 240:17, 244:10, 254:11, 286:25 **years** [45] - 12:9, 21:3, 21:8, 21:9, 21:12, 29:23, 45:18, 45:19, 51:18, 52:1, 54:18, 100:1, 100:6, 105:25, 117:7, 117:12, 118:7, 126:14, 126:18, 136:1, 136:4, 138:10, 140:16, 144:14, 155:21, 159:5, 167:18, 210:25, 211:3, 214:12, 214:21, 226:5, 229:22, 238:17, 244:20, 262:19, 267:6, 282:12, 282:23, 285:22, 286:9, 291:25, 299:9, 307:12 years) [1] - 244:15 yellow [1] - 111:7 yesterday [2] - 6:9, 312:9 York [1] - 138:1 you.. [1] - 68:17 young [1] - 22:17 youngest [3] - 16:23, 22:8, 23:3 yourself [16] - 26:4, 29:20, 39:10, 56:3, 122:17, 135:22, 154:20, 210:19, 243:15, 244:25, 282:1, 282:2, 282:8, 282:11, 283:15, 284:6

worker [1] - 20:10

yourselves [2] - 134:17, 301:22 Youth [1] - 20:19

Ζ

Zachary [1] - 15:6 zero [1] - 209:14 Zilka [27] - 27:1, 28:2, 93:24, 238:13, 238:14, 238:21, 238:24, 238:25, 281:14, 281:24, 282:8, 282:10, 282:20, 287:11, 287:21, 289:20, 294:18, 295:8, 296:4, 297:9, 297:21, 301:5, 301:12, 321:8, 322:10, 322:17, 323:11

ZILKA [1] - 281:21 **zone** [2] - 36:5, 69:4